DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 246 604 EC 162 812

TITLE The Gifted and Talented Program Study. Division of Public Schools Analysis and Recommendations [and] Report of the Gifted and Talented Program Study.

INSTITUTION Florida State Dept. of Education, Tallahassee. Div. of Public Schools.

PUB DATE Apr 84

NOTE 126p.; Statistical tables in Appendix G are marginally legible. Selected commissioned papers have been analyzed; see EC 162 813-815. Prepared by the Bureau of Education for Exceptional Students.

PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Curriculum; *Definitions; Eligibility; *Gifted; *Minority Groups; Program Development; State Programs; Student Characteristics; Talent; *Talent Identification

IDENTIFIERS *Florida

ABSTRACT

The report presents recommendations made by a panel of experts in gifted education regarding education for gifted students in Florida. Among recommendations are those for increasing minority representation in gifted programs, modifying the state definition to complement general intellectual ability with specific academic aptitude, using a multiple criteria matrix for eligibility decisions, and creating greater flexibility in program planning for gifted students. Specific recommendations for actions by the Florida Legislature, State Board of Education, Department of Education, and school districts are presented. A timeline from 1983-84 through 1987 is offered. The complete text of the report is included, with sections on the history of the study; findings regarding definitions; issues in screening, evaluation, and eligibility; aspects of programing and curriculum; and a discussion of program evaluation processes. Recommendations and implications of each section are presented. Among seven appendixes are commissioned papers on such topics as an international perspective on gifted and talented programs, and characteristics of the home environment of potentially gifted minority children. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED246604

THE GIFTED AND TALENTED PROGRAM STUDY

Division of Public Schools
Analysis and Recommendations

Report of the Gifted and Talented Program Study

April, 1984

EC162812

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

W. Cullar

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

DIVISION OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS

ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

of

Report of the Gifted and Talented Program Study

March, 1984

EC162812

The Bureau of Education for Exceptional Students, Division of Public Schools was given the responsibility for conducting a study of gifted and talented programs in Florida, as required by the 1983 Legislature. A panel of nationally known experts in the field of gifted education served as consultants for the study and prepared the final report. The panel members were Dr. William Durden, The Johns Hopkins University, Dr. Mary Frasier, University of Georgia, Dr. David Mealor, University of Central Florida, and Ms. Gail Smith, North Carolina Department of Education. Support was provided by the members of an Oversight Committee and staff from the Bureau of Education for Exceptional Students. The complete report provides details, including the history, methodology, and strategies used for the study, and copies of commissioned papers.

Personnel from the Division of Public Schools have reviewed and analyzed the report with respect to the appropriation language. The analysis led to recommendations for specific actions to be taken by the State Board of Education, the Department of Education, and the School Districts of Florida.

ANALYSIS OF PANEL'S REPORT

Increasing Minority Representation

The panel indicated that the current definition of general intellectual ability severely limits minority students from consideration for gifted programs. In addition, since there is no comprehensive screening process, minority and disadvantaged students are frequently excluded from consideration. The heavy reliance upon one piece of data for screening or for identification severely limits access to gifted programs.

The panel recommended that modifying the definition to include those who demonstrate specific academic ability would allow increased participation of minorities, the appropriate identification of specific academic talent, and a more comprehensive evaluation of a broad spectrum of the student's talents.

This panel concluded that the use of a statewide system of screening would allow more minority students to enter the "pool" for further evaluation. The development of a multiple criteria matrix would dispel the prevailing attitude that minority students are not capable of the level of superior intellectual performance required for participation in gifted programs. Much of the testimony asserted that if talented were added as a category to the definition, minority representation could be increased, implying that minority students could not be found as intellectually gifted, but could be found as talented in the visual and performing arts.

Florida's definition as stated and practiced, precipitates unfortunate outcomes for minority students. One, they will infrequently be referred for gifted progams and two, they will often fail to meet such a rigid and limited requirement. Rather than recommend two sets of criteria, one for gifted and one for talented, the panel

recommended a series of changes which, taken together, would increase the representation of minority groups.

The panel recommended that minority representation in gifted programs could be increased by:

a. modification of the definition to include specific academic ability,

b. requirements for systematic screening procedures, using multiple criteria,

c. use of a statewide standard checklist of gifted characteristics in student evaluation, and

d. use of a multiple criteria matrix for determining eligibility.

These recommendations are discussed in subsequent sections of this paper.

Criteria for Eligibility

Florida's definition of a gifted student is "one who has superior intellectual development and is capable of high performance. The mental development of a gifted student is two (2) standard deviations or more above the mean." (Rule 6A-6.3019, FAC.)

This current definition emphasizes general intellectual ability. Although the criteria for eligibility require the student to have a majority of the characteristics of a gifted child and to have a need for a special program as well as a superior intellectual quotient, the implication is that eligibility is primarily contingent upon a prescribed score on an individualized test of intelligence.

The panel recommended that the definition be modified to complement general intellectual ability with specific academic aptitude, thereby identifying a population of students who have the ability to excel in one or several educational experiences at a level and pace distinguished from the regular student. No specific wording was suggested, but a revised definition would also be reflected in the criteria for eligibility.

The panel recommended that a multiple criteria matrix be developed and used in the determination of eligibility. The matrix would include objective and subjective data and would provide for identification of specific areas of exceptional ability, thereby meeting the intent of an expanded definition addressing specific academic aptitude. In addition, the matrix would provide the staffing committee with a student profile on various attributes used in determining eligibility. The panel recommended that a specific checklist of gifted behaviors be developed and validated in Florida to measure characteristics of gifted students, and that this checklist be used by all school districts in the process of determining student eligibility. This would ensure uniform and consistent practices throughout the state.

These recommendations would provide for the introduction of specific academic talent without excluding the development of processes subsumed under general intellectual ability, and could dispel attitudes that minority students are not capable of the level of superior intellectual performance required for participation in a gifted program. The

panel concluded that this dichotomy of "gifted and talented" terminology has created a conceptual hierarchy where "talented" is perceived as not quite as good as gifted. The panel did not recommend separate criteria for those students talented in visual and performing arts, citing the pervasive attitude that if the definition included "talented" (i.e. visual and performing arts) more minority students would be eligible.

Extent to Which Gifted Programs Have Been Successful

Florida's national leadership in services to gifted students was recognized by the panel with specific attention drawn to the legislatively mandated program and special funds. The panel attributed much of the progress and potential growth of gifted programs in Florida to its placement within exceptional student education. The panel specifically recommended that the Individualized Educational Plan (IEP) be used to design a continuous program of studies for a child's exceptional abilities, by employing appropriate existing educational options to create an optimal match between the student's ability and the level and pace of the student's instruction, regardless of whether those options are available through regular or exceptional education programs.

The panel found that current practice in Florida has resulted in expanded educational opportunities for gifted students. Throughout the state, highly qualified and motivated teachers offer consequential and continuous instruction for gifted students.

The panel commended Florida for a number of programmatic efforts which demonstrate an imaginative attempt to create an optimal match between a student's ability and the level and pace of instruction. Greater use of these existing options, such as dual enrollment, advanced placement courses and subject level exams, would permit greater flexibility in program delivery models and allow students to take advantage of courses not necessarily designated as gifted. The panel recommended increased use of these options through joint efforts of exceptional and regular education personnel.

Student Achievement and Broadened Educational Opportunities

The panel noted that the heavy reliance on general intellectual ability for identification of students has made it difficult for school districts to develop an appropriate scope and sequence of curriculum. Curricula has primarily been defined as models of thought (Bloom's Taxonomy, Guilford's Structure of the Intellect, etc.), making these models the subject of instruction and creating arbitrarily determined educational experiences which do not interfere with the regular education curriculum. Present programs are based upon the treatment of topics within traditional academic curriculum and rely heavily upon the strength of an assigned teacher rather than the student's specific academic strengths and weaknesses.

The panel recommended increased application of existing mechanisms for acceleration, course modifications, summer programs, etc. to create greater flexibility in planning programs and in broadening the educational opportunities available for gifted students. Current achievement gains could be increased if assessment and programming procedures focused on a student's specific academic abilities in school situations. The panel also recommended additional use of options such as mentorships, magnet schools,

consultative models, out-of-grade placement, dual enrollment for students from junior and senior high schools and advanced placement courses. The appropriate use of these options should be reflected in the Individualized Educational Plans.

The panel concluded that student achievement and the broadening of educational opportunities can also be increased through systematic program evaluation. With a definite statement of philosophy and objectives related to expected student growth, better program evaluation would be possible and would assist in the identification of resources needed to enhance educational opportunities for gifted students within the district.

Cost Factors

Although Florida is the only state that funds gifted programs on an FTE basis and provides more funds for gifted education than any state except Pennsylvania, the panel discovered that the current system in the Florida Education Finance Program is perceived as a constraint to initiatives that provide a variety of program delivery models. A separate cost factor for talented was not recommended by the panel as an acceptable solution for the needs of minority gifted students. The panel recommended that to promote more flexibility in developing programs for gifted students, the weighted funding generated by a gifted student follow the student, regardless of the instructional program, provided that the needs of that student were being met. The panel recommended that the needs of artistically talented be met through "after-school" classes or the Governor's Summer Program.

DIVISION RECOMMENDATIONS

Having considered the panel's recommendations, the rationale for those recommendations, and the papers prepared for the study, the following actions are recommended by the Division of Public Schools. Panel recommendations for revisions in definitions, criteria for eligibility, and program improvement have been accepted in concept. Specific recommendations for these concepts are presented below. The panel's suggestion that the weighted funding follow the gifted student throughout the day regardless of program membership is not recommended. A section developed by the Division of Public Schools regarding funding of gifted programs is included in these recommendations.

Florida Legislature

1. In 1984, it is recommended that the Florida Legislature adopt proviso language which authorizes the Department of Education to use funds from the Challenge Grant Program or other funds for the purpose of implementing the activities to develop and field test the following:

   - systematic screening procedures,
   - standardized checklist of gifted characteristics, and
   - multiple criteria matrix.

2. For the 1986-87 year, it is recommended that the Florida Legislature adopt modifications to the cost factor and FTE projections for gifted programs, as needed to implement a revised rule.

State Board of Education

It is recommended that the State Board of Education adopt a revised rule for special programs for students who are gifted, to be effective for the 1986-87 school year. This rule would include:

a. a new definition which includes emphasis on specific academic ability;

b. criteria for eligibility based on

   1. A multiple criteria matrix of various student attibutes, such as, intellectual functioning, academic strengths, behavioral characteristics of gifted, and other data. (Weighted cut-off scoring would be adopted based on data obtained through a field test of the matrix. Two sample matrices are shown in the appendix.)

   2. Weighted scoring intended to identify 2-3% of the statewide population; and

c. Systematic screening procedures to assure equal access for consideration for gifted programs.

Department of Education

1. The Department will coordinate the development of a systematic screening procedure to be incorporated within the District Procedures which are required by Rule 6A-6.341, FAC, and are reviewed and approved by the Division of Public Schools.

2. The Department will coordinate the development of a standardized checklist of gifted characteristics for use statewide. This checklist will be part of the required District Procedures.

3. The Department will coordinate the development of the variables to be included in a multiple criteria matrix which will be used in determining eligibility for special programs for gifted students.

4. The Department will conduct a field test of the multiple criteria matrix, including sufficient racial and student data analysis to determine weights to be used in obtaining a criterion score and to recommend a weighted score which would identify 2-3% of the statewide population.

5. The Department will disseminate the panel's concern regarding program evaluation with those responsible for the Special Project on Program Evaluation in Polk County Schools, and will assist districts in the expansion and improvement of their implementation of existing requirements for program evaluation.

6. After State Board adoption of revisions to Rule 6A-6.3019, FAC, the Department will monitor school systems through the review and approval of the District Procedures and through the Division Comprehensive Audits, to ensure that revised screening and identification procedures are being accurately and effectively implemented.

7. The Department will conduct a systematic review and make recommendations for any appropriate changes in policies or procedures to eliminate administrative barriers to effective implementation of statutes and rules regarding accelerated programs, and shall disseminate technical assistance materials to encourage efficient use of these alternatives.

8. The Department will encourage provisions for special instructional opportunities for students who are talented in the visual and performing arts through the out of school learning program, the Governor's Summer Program, and advanced courses.

These tasks will be completed with assistance from knowledgeable professionals, parents, and community members.

School District

1. All school districts will have an opportunity for input into the Department tasks related to developing systematic screening procedures, developing a standardized checklist of behaviors of gifted students, and in developing a multiple criteria matrix.

2. On a competitive grant basis from funds allocated for the Challenge Grant program, selected districts will carry primary responsibility for developmental activities in the tasks mentioned above.

3. School districts will be asked to increase the number of enrichment and acceleration options made available to gifted students and to consider the use of the IEP for designing a continuous program of studies, which is responsive to the student's pace and level of learning.

4. School districts will expand and improve evaluation of programs for gifted students based on assistance provided by the Department and the Statewide Program Evaluation Project.

5. School Districts will adopt and institute procedures to ensure compliance with Rule 6A-6.3019, FAC, after the State Board of Education has adopted revisions.

Funding for Gifted Program

1. Priorities for 1984-85 Challenge Grant projects will identify the specific tasks related to development of systematic screening procedures, of a standardized checklist of behaviors of gifted students, and of a multiple criteria matrix, and funds shall be used to support these project activities.

2. A single cost factor for special programs for gifted students would continue and should provide adequate accommodations for the revised rule which is adopted by the State Board of Education. For the 1986-87 implementation of the revised rule, the part time (PT) limitation for use of the weighted cost factor should be removed.

3. Beginning in 1985-86 the Challenge Grant program will be redirected to provide support for gifted programs on a student formula basis. These funds shall be used by districts to accommodate instructional support needed for unique program delivery options.

4. Funds for the Governor's Summer Program should continue to provide support for the enrichment and acceleration of students with advanced abilities during the summer on college and university campuses.

The fiscal impact of these recommendations are:

- 1984-85 No change in funds requested

- 1985-86 No change in funds requested, but Challenge Grant funds to be changed from grant to formula distribution.

- 1986-87 Any change in FTE would be based on estimates resulting from the change of "Gifted - PT" funding to "Gifted" funding.

Timeline

1983-84 - Activities funded through appropriation for Gifted and Talented Program Study
- Conduct the Study
- Contract for Design of Field Test of Multiple Criteria Matrix and Design of Standardization of Checklist

1984-85 - Activities funded through Challenge Grant Program
- Development of Systematic Screening Procedure
- Development of a Standardized Checklist of Gifted Behaviors
- Development of a Multiple Criteria Matrix

- Activities without special funding
- Plan for redirection of Challenge Grant Program to student formula basis
- Project Weighted Full-Time Equivalent students (WFTE) and request funds for 1985-86

1985-86 - Activities funded through general revenue
- Conduct Field Test of Multiple Criteria Matrix and set weighted score for eligibility
- Standardize Checklist of Gifted Characteristics
- Rewrite Rule 6A-6.3019, FAC
- Print and disseminate the rule with appropriate technical assistance materials for implementing in school districts
- Review and approve District Procedures for 1986-87 implementation
- Distribute Challenge Grant Funds
- Project WFTE and request funds for 1986-87

1986-87 - Activities without special funding
- Monitor implementation to ensure that revised screening and identification procedures are being accurately implemented

- Activities with fiscal impact
- Remove the part time limitation for use of the weighted cost factor (Districts will be asked to consider this in FTE estimates for the 1986-87 year.)
- Project WFTE and request funds for 1987-88

Sample Matrix - North Carolina

IDENTIFICATION OF ACADEMICALLY GIFTED

Division for Exceptional Children
State Department of Public Instruction

July 1979, 1981 and October 1983 *

Programs for the Academically Gifted

1. Definition: Academically Gifted students are defined as those students who (1) possess demonstrated or potential intellectual, creative or specific academic abilities and (2) need differentiated educational services beyond those being provided by the regular school program in order to realize their potentialities for self and society. A student may possess singularly or in combination these characteristics: general intellectual ability; specific academic aptitude; creative or productive thinking abilities.

2. Identification Standards: Identification of students must be accomplished by multiple means. These methods include, but are not limited to teacher, peer and/or parent nominations; assessments of intelligence, achievement, performance, and/or creativity/divergent thinking; anecdotal records; and biographical data. No child shall be denied entry into the program on the basis of only one method of identification. Consideration must be given to the total minority populations in the school in making up the racial composition of the classes. Gifted children who are handicapped are not to be discriminated against in placement.

   Data on identification of academically gifted students for placement into programs and services shall include the following:

   a. standardized achievement or aptitude total or subtest scores.

   b. an intellectual assessment score. Individual intellectual quotient tests, such as the Stanford-Binet Form LM or the Wechsler Scales, are preferred over group tests.

   c. superior demonstrated ability in one or more content areas as indicated by grades or by demonstrated skills (products such as science projects, creative writing, etc.).

   d. recommendations by one or more school personnel. Behavioral scales and checklists may be used.

   Procedures for the Identification of Academically Gifted students, issued by the Division for Exceptional Children, must be used by all local educational agencies in student identification. The Student Identification Profile found in these Procedures shall be used to evaluate each student new to the program.

*Identification Guidelines were first issued for gifted and talented in 1979, reprinted in 1981, reprinted in 1983 to show programatic name change to academically gifted.

A local administrative unit may, if desired, gather additional data (see Procedures for specifics allowable) for assessing students who have narrowly missed the cutoff point and to insure non-discrimination.

Permission to deviate from the Definition and Procedures can be given by the Director, Division for Exceptional Children.

Procedures for the Identification of Academically Gifted Students

I. General Information

According to the Rules Governing Programs and Services for Children with Special Needs, a "child with special needs" must have an annual review of the GEP* to see that placement and service are appropriate. Each child will have an indepth reassessment at least every three years.

The earlier the identification, placement and service the better. The statewide testing program in grades one, two, three, six and nine gives baseline achievement data in every school in the State. An administrative unit may retest a child following due process procedures, if desired, to validate existing test data. Recommended tests can be found in these Procedures. As a student progresses in the academically gifted program from elementary grades into the secondary grades, more evaluation attention for placement can be given to demonstrated skills, individual performance and self nomination than to previously collected data. Task completion and academic success may carry more weight at this level than standardized test data.

Deviations from the Definition and Procedures must be approved by the Director, Division for Exceptional Children.

II. Identification Procedures

Identification procedures including observation, initial screening, referral, etc. are explained in Rules.... Those applicable to the academically gifted program shall be followed.

In beginning the identification procedure, a pool of possible candidates will be developed. This pool can be developed through the use of the "Teacher Observation and Recommendation Sheet" (included in these Procedures), the listing of a top percent of white and non-white students, and/or self and parent nomination. Development of such a pool will insure that children who are academically gifted, who are creative and productive thinkers, or who manifest gifted potentials will be included in the pool from which children will be evaluated for placement and service. Inclusion in the pool does not of itself constitute a formal student referral requiring parent notification. Initial screening of the pool will determine the students for whom formal referrals will be made.

In order to administer additional tests, parental permission must be obtained using your exceptional children's permission form. Careful data collection on all students to document that children who are culturally different, experientially deprived, or handicapped have not been discriminated against must be maintained. It is recommended that the Special Tests section in these Procedures be considered for use with these students.

*Group Education Program

Using these Procedures and the included Student Identification Profile, the School-Based Committee will collect the data to be used to evaluate students and to identify those students eligible for the gifted program. This recommendation will be given to the Administration Placement Committee for final decision. Those students meeting the State criteria and cutoff point will be offered programs and services, following receipt of parent permission for placement and preparation of the student's GEP.

A. Achievement or Aptitude Test Data:

Within the point system established in these Procedures, more weight is given to the achievement/aptitude component than to the other three components. The rationale for this additional weight is that, as time passes, more and more local educational agencies will use the data provided by the statewide testing program which becomes a common denominator across the state.

At the secondary level PSAT or SAT test data may be used in lieu of the statewide test data.

The chart below will be used to obtain the points a student receives on standardized achievement or aptitude test data. Total reading or total math scores or a composite score may be used depending on program goals. However, as a child is not necessarily gifted in all academic areas, discretion must be exercised in selection of these data to match the child's area of giftedness--for example, use math scores to assess a child highly gifted in math alone. Each student must be evaluated on his/her area(s) of giftedness and receive service in this area(s). Matching the child's area of giftedness to service will require flexibility on the part of the School-Based Committee. If a child is gifted in one or two areas, data collection throughout the identification procedure will reflect this -- i.e. achievement test data, grades, demonstrated skills, and biographical data.

The statewide testing programs for grades one and two do not give composite scores and are, in addition, resulting in many high scores. It is recommended that LEAs use the highest levels of reading and/or math percentiles for screening; to the children receiving high scores, administer a standardized achievement test to obtain the child's points.

Achievement or Aptitude Conversion Chart: Use the statewide test data or other comparable tests of this type.

96% and up = 8 points
93% - 95% = 7 points
89% - 92% = 6 points
85% - 88% = 5 points
77% - 84% = 4 points

B. Intelligence Quotient Data:

An administrative unit has the option of using individual test data, which are preferred, or group test data. Individual test data are more discrete.

Intelligence Quotient Data Conversion Chart:

96% and up = 5 points
93% - 95% = 4 points
89% - 92% = 3 points
85% - 88% = 2 points
77% - 84% = 1 point

C. Performance Data

Grades in a specific subject such as math or an average of academic grades may be used for student evaluation. Grade averages should refer to the past year of work at least. In classes not using numerical averages, the School-Based Committee will convert the grading system into percentiles or equate letters to the scale A=5, B=4, C=3.

If demonstrated ability/interest (such as outstanding science projects, superior creative writing products, etc.) is used rather than grades, this ability should be listed with a brief accompanying explanation (anecdotal records or biographical data). This option will enable a child successful in product production but lacking grade score success to receive consideration for service.

Evaluation in demonstrated ability/interest (superior, very good, etc.) will be compared with the average student's performance.

D. Recommendations:

One of the following checklists or behavioral scales appropriate to the child's grade placement is to be used with all students through grades 8 or 9 and be included in the placement folder with other test data:

- Early Childhood Checklist, K-3
- the Buncombe Behavioral Characteristics Scale, K-3 and 4-12
- the Weiss-Guilford Teacher Rating Scale, K-12
- the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Checklist, K-12
- the Renzulli-Hartman Scale, 4-12

Students are evaluated by professional personnel, usually teachers who are familiar with them, on predetermined characteristics of gifted child behavior in the area of ability to learn (academics), motivation and perseverance traits, creativity and productive thinking abilities, and leadership characteristics. Use of these instruments channels teacher opinion along the lines of what is a gifted child and helps to avoid lack of knowledge of desirable characteristics or an opinion that is too openended. Use of a behavioral scale or checklist will reveal student behaviors

in a broader vista than just academics. It is recommended that more than one person rate the student to avoid a single subjective opinion; an average of the personnel rating for the student could be used. Professional personnel need training in the use of scales and checklists to more accurately assess the student's abilities.

Additional data may be gathered and evaluated by the School-Based Committee on prospective gifted students through the collection of anecdotal records or biographical data. These data may give insights into potentials a child may have. Data on the child should be evaluated when compared with average children on a superior 5, very good 4, good 3, average 2, below average 1 point range. If such data are used, these points will be averaged with those from scales and checklists to arrive at no more than the maximum points allowable in the Student Identification Profile sheet and will be filed in the student's placement folder. Use of these recommendations will provide the School-Based Committee with data on a personal level that may not be generally known.

After grade nine, checklists or scales are not required but may be used if desired.

III. Maximum Points and Cutoff Score

Use of the Procedures and Student Identification Profile sheets will result in a maximum score of 23 points. All students who receive 19 points are to be offered programs and service. These Procedures will mean that identification standards become consistent statewide.

At the secondary level, as performance becomes more important and school districts may decide not to use behavioral scales, the point system may be adjusted by either of these two methods:

A. Omit the behavioral scales, double the points for performance to keep the 23 total points, and use the same cutoff and option.

B. Omit the behavioral scales and use 18 total points with 14 points required for placement and 13 points for the option (see IV below).

IV. Identification Option

A local educational agency may re-evaluate all students who receive 18 points according to this formula:

If a student's achievement or intelligence quotient score caused a lack of points, another appropriate test may be substituted, taken from the list of recommended tests given in these Procedures, to ascertain if the student receives the necessary 19 points.

STUDENT'S NAME_____

SCHOOL_____Gr.____AGE_____

TOTAL NUMBER OF POINTS_____

STUDENT IDENTIFICATION PROFILE

Indicate points after each item. Add the total number of points earned by a student.

REQUIRED DATA

I. Achievement or Aptitude Test Data:

Test Name_____

Subtest Used_____
(if applicable)

Date Given_____ Subtotal (Maximum 8 points)

Composite or Subtest(s)
Percentile Score _____% *_____

II. Intelligence Quotient Test Data:

Test Name_____ Subtotal (Maximum 5 points)

Date Given_____ *_____

Percentile Score_____%

Performance Data:

III. Grades (average or specific subject)

5	4	3	2	1
96%+ ( )	90-95% ( )	86-89% ( )	80-85% ( )	Below 79% ( )

or

Superior	Very Good	Good	Average	Below Average
( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

Demonstrated Ability

Area_____ Subtotal (Maximum 5 points)

*_____

IV. Recommendations: School Personnel

Name of Scale or Checklist

_____Points_____

(Anecdotal Records/Biographical Data Points_____)

Subtotal (Maximum 5 points)

*_____

TEACHER OBSERVATION/RECOMMENDATION SHEET

Step 1 - All teachers of the child's previous or present grade level may be asked to list a certain number of children in their classes in relationship to the ethnic/racial composition of the grade or school who may be the:

a. most creative children;

b. children with most leadership ability;

c. most scientifically or mathematically oriented children;

d. children who do the best critical thinking;

e. children who do the most detailed planning and can follow through with plans;

f. the decision makers;

g. the ones who take unlike ideas and create a new idea; and

h. most able children who are the most inconsiderate of others in terms of behavior.

Step 2 - Together with principal, guidance staff, etc. compare lists to determine number of frequencies in which names appear and list these.

Step 3 - Consult achievement and intelligence data on students listed to this point to compare recommendations with past performances.

Step 4 - Make recommendations as necessary based on findings, keeping in mind the racial composition and total number of children to be placed.

Step 5 - Begin referral process.

RECOMMENDED TESTS/INSTRUMENTS*

I. Intelligence

A. Individual: (Preferred)

Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale (ages 2 and over)
Houghton Mifflin Company

Vane Kindergarten Test (ages 4-6)
Clinical Psychology Publishing Company, Inc.

Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children - Revised (ages 5-15)

Wechsler Preschool and Primary Scale of Intelligence (ages 4-5-6)

Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Adults (ages 16 -)

B. Group

Short Form Test of Academic Aptitude or Test of Cognitive Skills ('81) McGraw-Hill

Cognitive Abilities Test (grades K-1, 2-3, 3-12)
Houghton Mifflin Company

Henmon-Nelson Tests of Mental Ability (grades K-2, 3-6, 6-9, 9-12)
Houghton Mifflin Company

Kuhlmann-Anderson Test (grades K-1, 2, 3-4, 4-5, 5-7, 7-9, 9-12)
Personnel Press

Lorge-Thorndike Intelligence Tests (grades K-13)
Houghton Mifflin Company

Otis-Lennon School Ability Test (grades K-12)
Harcourt Brace

II. Achievement Tests

California Achievement Tests (forms for all grade levels)
CTB/McGraw-Hill

Iowa Tests of Basic Skills (forms for all grade levels)
Houghton Mifflin Company

Metropolitan Achievement Tests (forms for all grade levels)
Psychological Corporation

SRA Achievement Series (grades 1-9)
Science Research Associates, Inc.

Stanford Achievement Test (forms for grades 1.5-9)
Psychological Corporation

Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (grades 2-12)
CTB/McGraw Hill

* As tests are revised and undergo name changes, they are considered a part of this list.

Wide Range Achievement Test, Revised (WRAT) (ages 5-11, 12+)
Guidance Associates of Delaware, Inc.

Peabody Individual Achievement Test (PIAT)
American Guidance, Inc.

III. Aptitude

Academic Promise Test (grades 6-9)
abstract reasoning, language, numerical verbal and nonverbal
Psychological Corporation

Differential Aptitude Tests (grades 8-12)
Psychological Corporation

Guilford-Zimmerman Aptitude Survey (grades 9-16)
Sheridan Psychological Services, Inc.

IV. Special Tests to Give Additional Data

S.O.I. Learning Abilities Test
S.O.I. Institute, El Segundo, California
("this is not an intelligence test ... It is a test of special learning abilities... to form the foundation cluster for a student's learning reading and arithmetic." It will help pick out the able student and is a diagnostic instrument which can be used individually or in groups. It is based on Guilford's Structure of Intellect factors.)

Guilford Creativity Tests for Children (specific IQ tests--grades 4-6)
Sheridan Psychological Services, Inc.

Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking - Verbal (grades 4-12)
Personnel Press

Torrance Tests of Creative Thinking - Figural (grades 1-12)
Personnel Press (use Frank Williams' shorter key)

Ross Test of Higher Cognitive Processes (grades 4-6)
Academic Therapy Publications
Designed to assess child's higher-level thinking skills; may be administered to groups or to an individual. Can be used as a screening instrument and to assess individual student performance.

SOMPA (System of Multicultural Pluralistic Assessment)
Institute for Pluralistic Assessment Research and Training - ages 5-11

This instrument requires special training of the evaluator. It can be used for children who are experientally deprived. Its results may be averaged with other data or used in lieu of other instruments.

Alpha Biographical Inventory (grades 9-12)
Institute for Behavioral Research in Creativity, Salt Lake City, Utah

Biographical Inventory, Form R (grades 9-12) Keys for creativity in art and music, academics, and leadership; 300 items; North Carolina Department of Public Instruction

(A 100- item instrument developed from the BI, Form R may be obtained from the Institute for Behavioral Research in Creativity, Salt Lake City, Utah.)

Culture Fair Intelligence Test (ages 4-3, 8-14, 13-16) Cattell and Cattell. Institute for Personality and Ability Testing (IPAT)

Goodenough-Harris Drawing Test (ages 3-51) "Draw-a-Man-Test" Harcourt, Brace and Jovanovich

Stallings' Environmentally-Based Screen (S.E.B.S.)
This is a measure which can be used for initial screening of culturally different children. "SEBS is a quick supplement to existing instruments of intelligence testing; it is not intended to replace any existing instrument now available." It is especially useful with children who attend neighborhood schools.

Dr. Clifford Stallings
U.S. International University
San Diego, California

Used with permission of the North Carolina State Department of Public Instruction.

STATE OF FLORIDA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TALLAHASSEE 32301

RALPH D. TURLINGTON
COMMISSIONER

WENDY H. CULLAR, Ed.D.
BUREAU OF EDUCATION
FOR EXCEPTIONAL STUDENTS
DIVISION OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS

March 8, 1984

The Honorable Ralph D. Turlington
Commissioner of Education
Florida Department of Education
The Capitol
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Dear Commissioner Turlington:

This letter serves to transmit to your office the study of gifted and talented programs, as provided in Item 396A, Chapter 83-300, Laws of Florida.

The panel recognized Florida's national leadership in the field of gifted education, and enjoyed the opportunity to work with staff from the Florida Department of Education, and to hear the testimony of Floridians. The Department personnel and representatives of local school districts and other agencies who participated in the hearings, and the commissioned papers provided valuable information for our study.

The recommendations contained in this report have been made after consideration of all data and input available to the study panel, and it is hoped that the recommendations will provide assistance in the continued growth of quality education for gifted and talented students in Florida.

Sincerely,

William Durden

William Durden, Director
Center for the Advancement of Academically Talented Youth, John Hopkins University

Mary Fraiser

Mary Fraiser, Associate Professor
Department of Education Psychology, University of Georgia

David Mealor

David Mealor, Director
School Psychology Program, University of Central Florida

Gail Smith

Gail Smith, Chief Consultant
Gifted Programs, North Carolina Department of Education

DBC:jps

Affirmative action/equal opportunity employer

REPORT OF THE GIFTED AND TALENTED PROGRAM STUDY

Prepared for the
Commissioner of Education

Florida Department of Education
Division of Public Schools
Bureau of Education for Exceptional Students

March 1984

Consultant Panel:

Dr. William Durden, Johns Hopkins University
Dr. Mary Frasier, University of Georgia
Dr. David Mealor, University of Central Florida
Ms. Gail Smith, North Carolina Department of Education

PREFACE

A. History of the Study

The 1983 Legislative requirement provided Florida an opportunity to review and examine gifted and talented programs. For over twenty-five years the state has provided exceptional education programs for gifted students. These programs have become increasingly defined and expanded to meet the individualized needs of the intellectually gifted student with the advent of the 1976 mandate.

Florida continues to serve as a state of distinction within gifted and talented education. State expenditures for gifted education are the second highest in the nation. Special legislative initiatives, such as the Governor's Summer Program and the Challenge Grant Program, provide incentives for school districts to work in tandem with colleges and universities to provide innovative educational programs and summer opportunities for gifted students.

This study addresses a concern of national importance, that of identifying minority gifted and talented students. The potential of these students is too often missed and thus lost to us as a society. In some school districts in Florida, minority students, primarily Black and Hispanic, comprise the majority of the school age population. However, they continue to be underrepresented within gifted and talented programs.

Item 396A, Chapter 83-300, Laws of Florida, provided an appropriation for a study on gifted and talented programs in Florida. The appropriations language reads as follows:

> THE LEGISLATURE RECOGNIZES THAT MINORITY STUDENTS HAVE NOT BEEN ADEQUATELY IDENTIFIED AND GIVEN OPPORTUNITIES TO BENEFIT FROM GIFTED PROGRAMS. THEREFORE, THE COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION SHALL CONDUCT A STUDY WITH THE FUNDS PROVIDED IN SPECIFIC APPROPRIATION 396A OF THE MEMBERSHIP IN GIFTED PROGRAMS AND TALENTED PROGRAMS, CRITERIA FOR ELIGIBILITY FOR GIFTED PROGRAMS AND TALENTED PROGRAMS, AND THE EXTENT TO WHICH PUBLIC SCHOOL PROGRAMS FOR THE GIFTED AND TALENTED HAVE BEEN SUCCESSFUL IN INCREASING STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT AND BROADENING EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR THESE STUDENTS. THE STUDY SHALL ALSO RECOMMEND A COST FACTOR AND SPECIFIC CRITERIA FOR SPECIAL PROGRAMS FOR TALENTED STUDENTS FOR ADOPTION BY THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION. THE RESULTS OF THE STUDY SHALL BE SUBMITTED BY MARCH 1, 1984, TO THE STATE BOARD AND THE CHAIRMEN OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATE COMMITTEES WITH RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHANGES IN STATE LAW, STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION RULES, OR SCHOOL DISTRICT PROCEDURES.

The Bureau of Education for Exceptional Students, Division of Public Schools was given the responsibility for organizing and implementing

this study. Four consultants with expertise in the area of gifted and talented education were selected to conduct the study and prepare the final report. Support was provided by the members of the Oversight Committee (See Appendix G) and staff from the Bureau of Education for Exceptional Students.

The following individuals served as consultants for the study:

Dr. Willian Durden, Director
Center for the Advancement
of Academically Talented Youth
The Johns Hopkins University
Baltimore, Maryland

Dr. Mary Frasier
Associate Professor
Department of Education Psychology
University of Georgia
Athens, Georgia

Dr. David Mealor, Director
School Psychology Program
University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Ms. Gail Smith
Chief Consultant
Gifted Programs
North Carolina Department of Education
Raleigh, North Carolina

B. Panel Activities

The study panel was assembled during September and December of 1983 to review data, conduct a series of statewide hearings and analyze information. An organizational meeting was held in conjunction with the Fall meeting of exceptional student education administrators. During this meeting, the panel reviewed information, met with school district personnel and organized to carry out the task. The next meeting was a series of hearings held in Miami, Orlando and Tallahassee for the purpose of collecting information from various school district personnel, parents and concerned community members.

A final meeting was held in January, 1984, in Tallahassee to develop the study report. The panel reviewed information contained in papers commissioned for the study:

Increasing Minority Representation in Programs for the Gifted and Characteristics of the Home Environment of Potentially Gifted Minority Children by Dr. Mary Frasier, Associate Professor, University of Georgia, Second Vice-President, National Association for Gifted Children (See Appendix C)

The Challenge: To Nurture The Full Development of Potential In All Gifted Students by Dr. Joanne Rand Whitmore, Assistant Dean for Teacher Education, Kent State University, President, The Association for the Gifted (See Appendix D)

An International Perspective on Gifted and Talented Programs by Dr. Dorothy Sisk, Professor, University of South Florida, Secretariat, World Council for Gifted and Talented Children (See Appendix E)

Additional data collected from a questionnaire sent to 230 randomly selected public schools was analyzed by Dr. David Mealor and presented to the panel for review. The purpose of the questionnaire was to collect information concerning school level perceptions of gifted and talented programs.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PREFACE	iii
PART I	
Introduction	1
Definition of Gifted and Talented.	3
Screening, Evaluation and Eligibility.	5
Programming and Curriculum	7
Program Evaluation	10
PART II	
Appendix A - An Analysis of the District Procedures for Florida's Gifted Program	15 17
Appendix B - Annotated Bibliographies	25
1. Minority Representation in Gifted and Talented Programs	27
2. Program Effectiveness in Gifted and Talented Programs	37
Appendix C - Commissioned Papers: Increasing Minority Representation in Programs for the Gifted. . . . and Characteristics of the Home Environment of Potentially Gifted Minority Children: by Dr. Mary Frasier, Associate Professor, University of Georgia	45
Appendix D - Commissioned Paper: The Challenge: To Nurture The Full Development of Potential In All Gifted Students: by Dr. Joanne Rand Whitmore, Assistant Dean for Teacher Education, Kent State University, President, The Association for Gifted	65
Appendix E - Commissioned Paper: An International Perspective On Gifted and Talented Programs by Dr. Dorothy Sisk, Professor, University of South Florida, Secretariat, World Council For The Gifted	77

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PART II - continued

Appendix F - Gifted and Talented Program Study Questionnaire - An Analysis by Dr. David Mealor, University of Central Florida 87

Appendix G - Summary of Activities 97

INTRODUCTION

Florida has long been recognized as a national leader in providing programs and services to identified gifted students. Legislative mandate and special funding have been complemented by varying degrees of commitment at the local level--commitment that includes public advocacy, financial support, and engergetic innovation. Testimony provided to this panel has documented and applauded these strengths when appropriate, but has also indicated inconsistencies and inequities that must be vigorously confronted and corrected to ensure that Florida remains a bellwether of the best practice for the education of gifted youth. Much of the progress and potential for growth for the gifted program should be attributed to its placement under the broad umbrella of Florida's exceptional student education program where there is a documented sensitivity to the special needs of gifted students. Efforts to maximize the sensitivity by increased contact with regular education for the purpose of implementing programs for exceptional abilities is recognized and applauded.

In response to the Legislature's recognition that minority students have not been sufficiently identified and given opportunities to benefit from gifted education programs, the Commissioner of Education established, with funds provided under Appropriation 396A, a panel of experts. Their task was to investigate membership in gifted programs and talented programs, criteria for eligibility of gifted and talented programs, and degree of success of gifted and talented programs to increase student achievement and to broaden educational opportunities for these students.

Two specific issues addressed in all activities of the panel of experts were to answer the following questions:

1. How can minority representation in gifted and talented programs be increased? and

2. What are the effects of the current school program for the gifted and talented?

Results of all inquiries are organized around four essential areas:

1. Definition of Gifted and Talented
2. Screening, Evaluation, and Eligibility
3. Programming and Curriculum
4. Program Evaluation

It is these four areas which, then, lend substance to Florida's current initiative and, at once cause concern for the maintenance of the most excellent activity on behalf of one of the state's most precious resources, its youth.

The state's mandate to reexamine its gifted programs at this moment underscores the commitment of Florida to educational excellence. While the nation calls for higher standards of excellence Florida responds with legislative efforts to guarantee high levels of expectations and performance for its citizens.

This study and its consequent implementation directs itself to that area of excellence that guarantees the most responsible and accountable response from those youngsters who have the highest potential for the fulfillment of excellence.

DEFINITION OF GIFTED AND TALENTED

According to Florida's State Board of Education Rule 6A-6.3019, FAC, the gifted student is one who has superior intellectual development and is capable of high performance. The mental development of a gifted student is two (2) standard deviations above the mean." This definition limits giftedness to general intellectual ability and implies that only a prescribed score on a test of mental ability can determine that ability.

While general intellectual ability is a legitimate category as specified in the U.S.O.E.'s definition (1971) and is a popular descriptor of mental ability, it is very difficult to accommodate its development in a gifted program. We applaud Florida's attempt to develop this trait but suggest that attention to the specific area(s) of exceptional ability may result in more well-defined and accountable gifted programs as well as increase minority participation.

EFFECTS OF THE DEFINITION UPON MINORITY REPRESENTATION

Two observations regarding the intellectual ability of minority students cause this definition to have a serious and limiting effect on the representation of minority students in gifted programs. A prevailing attitude is that minority students are not capable of the level of superior intellectual performance required for participation in gifted programs. Much of the oral and written testimony received during the statewide hearings asserted that if talented were added as a category to the definition, minority representation could be increased. That is, minority students could not be found in gifted (i.e., intellectual) areas but they could be found in talented (i.e., art and music) areas.

Secondly, it has frequently been reported that blacks tend to score at least one standard deviation below that of whites on measures of intellectual functioning. This reported difference often leads to or stimulates descriptions of minority students as being irreparably deficient in academic areas.

Florida's definition as stated and practiced both precipitates and exacerbates unfortunate outcomes for gifted minority students. One, they will infrequently be referred for gifted programs and two, they will often fail to meet such a rigid and limited requirement.

It should be noted that part 2 of this rule (6A-6.3019, FAC) describes the criteria denoting eligibility to include three categories of data: (1) superior intellectual development, i.e., an IQ of two standard deviations above the mean, (2) a majority of characteristics of gifted children, and (3) the need for a special program. However, besides the limitations implied by the definition, written and oral testimony, as well as evidence of daily practice, indicate that the operational definition of gifted participation is restricted to evidence of two standard deviations above the mean as determined by a standardized test of intelligence. The addition of the variety of cognitive and behavioral characteristics specified in part 2 appears to have little effect on the determination of who will be eligible to participate.

Thus, the presentation and incorrect interpretation of the definition severely limits minority students for consideration for participation in gifted programs. It does not allow for consideration of other information, despite evidence of potential intellectual abilities that can be determined through other and legitimate means. In addition, the reliance on one piece of data to determine eligibility severely limits the amount of information available to make instructional decisions for participating students. This practice, then, not only limits the opportunities for all potentially eligible students, especially minority students, to be fairly evaluated for participation in gifted programs but it also limits their opportunity to have an appropriate instructional program planned for them.

EFFECTS OF DEFINITION ON GIFTED PROGRAM SUCCESS

While general intellectual ability is certainly an acceptable area for distinguishing characteristics among peoples it is a concept laden with severe and conflicting opinions as to definition. Given the difficulty in coming to terms with the nature of general intellectual ability itself and its capacity to be nurtured effectively within an institutional setting, one can expect discord between the definition of the identified groups and the eventual form of program delivery.

Such discontinuity was clearly evident during the statewide hearings. While the gifted population is identified principally on the basis of IQ scores to locate general intellectual ability, the curriculum response for this group, when it does exist, reflects the inability of scholars and educators to devise an appropriate scope and sequence of K-12 course work. In addition, there is no way to effectively evaluate the success of such ambiguous educational pursuits.

While some school districts have planned and implemented a K-12 curriculum, others, however, have based their gifted programs on a series of educational experiences for the students that are often a superficial treatment of topics within the traditional academic curriculum. There is the added disadvantage that the course of instruction is developed more upon the curriculum interest and strength of an assigned teacher rather than the identification of a student's specific academic strengths and weaknesses. Often it appears that students are assigned to special classes without evidence of extraordinary ability in the subject. The result of this inability to translate general intellectual ability to the practical contingencies of school instruction results not in the systematic advancement of the intellect but rather in only a half-hearted treatment of special academic subjects among a population almost randomly qualified for intensive participation.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The population to be served in gifted programs should be redesigned to designate those who have the ability to excel in one or several educational experiences at a level and pace distinguished from the

regular student. Such a perspective would permit increased participation of minorities in gifted programs as a direct result of the appropriate identification of special academic talent rather than the more ambiguous category of general intellectual ability. Such a perspective might also suggest concrete initiatives to include more comprehensive evaluation of a broad spectrum of legitimate talent.

2. The definition should be modified to complement general intellectual ability with specific academic aptitude. Such a definition will permit school administrators and teachers to respond educationally to extraordinary children in a manner which both fulfills a desperate need in our country to provide a comprehensive and challenging education in both the fundamentals and subtleties of math, science, and the humanities--and is consistent with their primary task to convey disciplined knowledge and cognitive skills from one generation to the next. Of course, the introduction of specific academic talent to the target population should not exclude the development of those processes subsumed under general intellectual ability, but rather from the methods of possible inquiry within the specific discipline of academic thought.

3. The criteria for eligibility should allow for the more thorough discussion of multiple criteria for determining participation in the gifted program.

SCREENING, EVALUATION, AND ELIGIBILITY

As delineated in Rule 6A-6.3019, FAC, Florida defines gifted students as those who:

-score two (2) standard deviations above the mean on an individual test of intelligence as administered by a certified specialist in school psychology;

-have a majority of characteristics of gifted children according to a standard scale or checklist; and

-demonstrate a need for a special program.

Testimony has revealed that while a multi-criteria approach to evaluation is indicated in these rules, most school systems focus primarily on the IQ score at the expense of the other possible components because of the existing definition. This strict adherence to the use of IQ in the evaluation process excludes certain minority and disadvantaged students from eligibility. Responses to a questionnaire sent to randomly selected schools in the State of Florida indicated the use of a wide array of standardized group achievement and IQ tests for screening (see Appendix F). Current literature points out that while screening is a much-needed preliminary step in the evaluation process, limiting this screening to standardized test results will serve to exclude many minority and disadvantaged students from consideration.

A comprehensive screening process would assist in the development of a large pool of students who will be given further consideration as to their eligibility for the gifted and talented program. Inclusion in the pool should be based on a wide variety of available data collected in a systematic manner: standardized test scores, grades, informal checklists, parent/teacher/peer nomination, anecdotal records, etc. The use of both objective and subjective data will help ensure that minority and disadvantaged students would not be denied entry into the pool. A review of each student's data would then determine which students should be referred for further testing or additional data collection.

Multiple criteria should also be used in the total evaluation process to determine student eligibility. By utilizing a combination of data (e.g., standardized test scores or subtest scores as well as other indicators such as grades, parent/teacher behavioral rating scales, anecdotal records/case studies, etc.), a profile of each student will emerge that reaches beyond the current one-dimensional definition of giftedness and allows for recognition of specific subject area strengths. The use of both objective and subjective data benefits that student who performs well in class and is motivated to achieve but whose test scores do not indicate exceptional intelligence. The use of multiple criteria in student evaluation brings with it several advantages: increased minority representation without the establishment of dual criteria (i.e., separate eligibility standards for white and minority or disadvantaged students); improved recognition of specific student strengths, carrying with it implications for expanded placement opportunities; and increased consistency with a broader based definition.

A separate but related issue involves the screening and evaluation process in the primary grades. When applied in the primary grades, the screening and evaluation process can become clouded by outside factors even when a wide variety of data are considered. It is not unusual for a kindergarten child from an advantaged home to seem to have the verbal skills and behavioral characteristics that may make him eligible for the gifted program. Conversely, a minority student with potential might be overlooked because he does not demonstrate these traits. Special care is required in early identification. Better utilization of Florida's Primary Education Program (PREP) has the potential for improving screening, evaluation and programming in these early grades.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. School systems should develop specific screening practices to encourage nondiscriminatory and uniform review of existing data (e.g., background information, teacher/parent ratings, achievement test totals or subtest scores, grades in specific academic subjects, previous accomplishments, etc.). Early identification could be assisted through the PREP assessment of students manifesting exceptional ability in one or more areas.

2. An identification criteria matrix that includes objective and subjective data should be utilized as a means of ensuring an

identification process consistent with current literature and practices in gifted education.

3. The development and validation of a specific checklist of gifted behaviors to be used by all school districts in determining student eligibility would help ensure uniform and consistent practices statewide.

4. School systems should be monitored to ensure that the screening and identification procedures are being accurately and effectively implemented. These screening and identification procedures should be consistent with program definition to ensure increased program effectiveness.

PROGRAMMING AND CURRICULUM

In A Resource Manual For The Development and Evaluation of Special Programs For Exceptional Students - Volume II-G: Gifted, any successful instructional program is characterized by the need to have its philosophy firmly established, and, further, that such "a philosophy must be based on theoretical models that have been repeatedly shown to capitalize on the specific characteristics of gifted students." Recommended models are Bloom's Taxonomy, Guilford's Structure of the Intellect and Renzulli's Enrichment Triad, with reference to an example of a possible philosophy it is stated that "the overall goal of the gifted program is to encourage and facilitate higher levels of thinking, communication, independent study skills, leadership abilities, productivity, creativity and self-awareness." The curriculum is characterized by the urgency to establish specific goals and objectives designed to meet the unique needs and learning styles of gifted students and by necessity becomes oriented about such models.

EFFECTS OF DEFINTION UPON MINORITY REPRESENTATION IN GIFTED AND TALENTED PROGRAMS AND THE EFFECTS OF THE CURRENT SCHOOL PROGRAMS FOR THE GIFTED AND TALENTED

The comments below apply equally for the effects upon minority representation in gifted and talented programs and for the effectiveness of the current school programs for the gifted and talented. Conspicuously absent in the current Florida definition of a curriculum and instructional program is a treatment of the specific abilities normally treated in the school environment. No mention is made of actual investigation in English, foreign language, science or mathematics and yet, most existing programs for the gifted try to accommodate the gifted in specific academic subjects. For example, a social studies course may be offered to all identified gifted in a particular grade, regardless of a student's specific ability. The course is on very poor pedagogical footing, trying to introduce and/or reinforce theoretical models of intelligence without wandering too far into specific academic abilities. Exercise of theoretical models of thought without a discipline base in a content area is, according to this panel, best conceived as extracurricular in nature. The cumulative effect of defining a curriculum for the gifted solely on adherence to supposed models of thought is either to make these models themselves the subject of

instruction and thus to deprive high ability youth of essential experiences from which they could profit or to forego any attempt to cultivate thinking skills by creating arbitrarily determined educational experiences which do not interfere with the regular curriculum but, in consequence, are rendered superficial.

Despite this general characteristic of the education of the gifted in Florida, it must be stated that, current practice notwithstanding, the gifted program has resulted in expanded educational opportunities for children. Indeed, throughout the state one finds highly qualified and motivated teachers offering consequential and continuous instruction for their gifted students. Nevertheless, this positive disposition toward giftedness in Florida and the current individual successes of the program could prove even more extensive if assessment and programming procedures focused on student specific abilities in the school situation. Attention to these various abilities would also permit expansion of minority participation in exceptional programming.

A reasonable feature of a course of study for gifted children, one which would permit students exposure to much needed knowledge in mathematics, sciences and the humanities, for example, is one that assesses the individual abilities of a child and then offers challenging instruction in that particular content area. The knowledge presented is combined with theoretical thought models as an ancillary element emanating from the subject itself. Indeed, the most current thinking in the field of gifted and talented education strives to resolve the apparent conflict between the implications of the terminology "gifted" and "talented" as shown by a quote from National Report on Identification: Assessment and Recommendation for Comprehensive Identification of Gifted and Talented Youth, by Susanne Richert, with James Alvino and Rebecca C. McDonnel, 1982.

> The consultants at the Identification Conference asserted that "talented" should be used to refer to a specific ability as opposed, for example, to general intellectual ability. Therefore the more the field of gifted education recognizes that exceptional abilities--in whatever area(s)--need to be applied in a specific content so that the result is a performance or product, the less sense is made by creating an implicit hierarchy that engenders elitism: "talented" is not quite as good as gifted.

The difficulty with the regular curriculum for the gifted child is not that it contains the wrong subjects, but rather that it presents this material often at the wrong time, in the wrong way and for the wrong reasons.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. In order to construct a reasonable and comprehensive curriculum for gifted students permitting scope and sequence from grades K-12, the content, pace and order of instruction in various coursework must be made to reflect an individual student's or group of students' peculiar exceptional abilities and level of learning.

2. In order to achieve the objectives of "1" above, Florida educators should take advantage of existing regulations permitting flexibility in offering program delivery models and responding to student learning patterns. The panel of experts discovered, regrettably, that Florida educators were either unaware of or reluctant to use measures already present to adjust the educational process to reflect a student's individual pace and level of learning. These include the use of acceleration mechanisms and alternative programs of graduation, dual enrollment, secondary level subject area examinations and advanced placement.

3. To meet the above requirements for considerable curriculum flexibility, students must take advantage of courses not necessarily designed specifically as gifted. For example, an eighth grader who by various approved means, demonstrates competency in Algebra I and II could be enrolled in a regular tenth grade geometry class. While the class itself is not classified as "gifted", the placement of the eighth grader in this class, meeting his advanced abilities is an appropriate treatment of his ability. The same situation would hold for younger than normal age students enrolled individually in Advanced Placement coursework.

4. To accommodate curriculum flexibility the funding formula for gifted education in Florida must be altered to follow the individual student and his or her needs rather than a general, and perhaps inappropriate, program. In addition, the current funding system by FTE is perceived to constrain initiatives to provide a variety of program delivery models that would advance appropriately a child's specific abilities, therefore, must be reexamined.

5. The IEP (Individualized Educational Plan) should be used imaginatively to design a continuous program of studies for a child's exceptional abilities. To accomplish this task most effectively every effort should be made to exploit appropriate program delivery models and educational options to create an optimal match between the student's ability and the level and pace of his or her instruction. Administrators should be sensitive to a "smorgasbord of educational opportunities" which includes "after-school" and Saturday classes, mentorships, magnet schools, summer experiences, consultative models, out-of-grade placement in regular courses, multi-county program initiatives, dual college enrollment, and Advanced Placement programs. Florida is to be cited for a number of programmatic efforts which demonstrate an imaginative attempt to match student ability with level and pace of instruction; however, school administrators and teachers must be encouraged to pull together an appropriately challenging course of studies for a child which employs a variety of these options and in so doing continues to match student ability with pace and level of learning. Response to the gifted child should be primarily fixed on the youth's ability and the application of various delivery systems to nurture that ability. In this effort, more extensive use could be made of "after-school" classes or the Governor's Summer Programs. These options provide a most important supplementary opportunity for instruction to those students possessing visual and performing arts talents. Dual enrollment of junior high school or high school students

in college coursework provides a viable option for many students who possess talent developed to such a degree that the regular school personnel or curricula cannot accommodate that child. However, caution should be exercised by remembering that the focus here is upon an individual child's ability and not a group of students. That individual child must be permitted special student status at a local college or university when feasible.

IMPLICATIONS

1. The implementation of recommendations cited by the Panel of Experts will require Florida educators to be willing to exercise responsible imagination and flexibility in school programming. The overall result, however, will be a more appropriate course of study for gifted and talented students that matches their ability and program needs.

2. Implicit in program effectiveness is the selection of teachers. Again, administrative flexibility is essential. The appropriate teacher for a gifted and talented student may not be found in the home school but rather in a neighboring school and/or special summer program. In addition, the regular education faculty through inservice or university training programs must be made sensitive to the traits and needs of gifted and talented students since this target population may be placed in the regular classroom to obtain an optimal match between ability and level of instruction.

3. Training programs for gifted and talented teachers may need to be reexamined to ensure that teachers completing such a program have the knowledge and skills necessary to respond to and foster each student's abilities. It should also be realized that teachers at elementary grade levels have differing needs from secondary level teachers whose knowledge in one or several requisite content areas is as important as a thorough grounding in gifted and talented education.

4. A final implication has its roots in each school district where concerted efforts to provide an appropriate program or program options for each gifted and talented student becomes more clearly defined. Through a defined philosophy, instructional goals and statements, and K-12 scope and sequence, the quality and effectiveness of that program can be seen and evaluated.

PROGRAM EVALUATION

One of the major features of any program evaluation is that the program have a definite statement of philosophy and a clearly stated and reasonable objective for the course of study. The absence of measurable instructional objectives for specific gifted and talented programs was noted in testimony received by this Panel but it should be pointed out that gifted and talented program evaluation nationally is an area with more questions than answers. The most frequent method of evaluating program effectiveness cited during testimony was the use of informal questionnaires or checklists, a method of evaluation that is relatively simple and provides

information which can be easily handled. The information obtained, however, seldom provides any significant insight into overall student progress and rarely leads to any programmatic change.

A second method of evaluating effectiveness is the use of norm-referenced tests--inadequate when one considers that gifted and talented children are often functioning at the upper end of the scale (98th-99th percentile) leading to the conclusion that the school is unable to measure student gain. Off-age testing or specific criterion-referenced measures may provide more meaningful information relative to desired student outcomes within the gifted and talented program. Information provided from the assessment process should be included in the development of a specific program to meet the individual needs of the student.

It must be kept in mind that in order to maintain programs and services at high levels, honest evaluation of the program is crucial. Programs cannot overlook student progress, yet actual program evaluation is often overlooked or ignored. Gallagher, et al. (1981:158) noted that gifted and talented program evaluation has been criticized for:

1. over-reliance on attitudinal data for assessing program worth;

2. use of inappropriate (invalid) tests for assessing student achievement; and

3. lack of careful documentation and evaluation of actual curriculum implemented in the program.

While a number of school districts have developed a continuous and sequential program, others lack continuity and coordination between schools and grade levels which limits any attempts at precise program evaluation.

There is needed a clearly defined system of program evaluation that should include:

1. what the program intends to accomplish relative to identified student abilities and needs;

2. how the program will go about accomplishing this; and

3. what the benefits to students will be.

With an evaluation in place, the district will be in a position to monitor and determine if any changes or modifications are needed. A planned program evaluation assists the school district in determining if gifted and talented students are motivated through the existing program offerings. At the same time, the reevaluation of individual student goals and objectives would be made easier if such an evaluation system were in place.

Specific measurement devices used in this task should not be limited to paper and pencil tests. For certain students the desired outcome may be in the development of a product or presentation. Performance levels could be stated to determine if the student is making progress toward the attainment of a particular objective. Because program and student evaluations are

interrelated, data must be collected and analyzed that address individual student performance as well as overall program design.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is the recommendation of this Panel that Florida school districts design and implement a system of program evaluation for their gifted students. This evaluation program should focus on the monitoring of student progress and overall program effectiveness.

IMPLICATIONS

1. Program evaluation allows districts to determine if programs have been successful by measuring student achievement in specified ability areas.

2. Program evaluation assists school districts in determining what additional resources are needed to enhance educational opportunities.

3. Program evaluation provides documentation of overall program effectiveness and includes student performance, further justifying the need for continued legislative support.

PART II

APPENDICES

Appendix A:	An Analysis of the District Procedures for Florida's Gifted Programs
Appendix B:	Annotated Bibliographies
Appendix C:	Commissioned Papers - Dr. Mary Frasier
Appendix D:	Commissioned Paper - Dr. Joanne Rand Whitmore
Appendix E:	Commissioned Paper - Dr. Dorothy Sisk
Appendix F:	Gifted and Talented Program Study Questionnaire - A Summary
Appendix G:	Summary of Activities

APPENDIX A

An Analysis of District Procedures

for

Florida's Gifted Programs

An Analysis

of

The District Procedures

for

Florida's Gifted Program

Submitted to: Deborah Bellflower, Consultant
Gifted Education
Bureau of Education for Exceptional Students

By: Julia G. Moore
September 23, 1983

The following report is submitted as a part of The Study mandated by the Florida Legislature to study the membership of its gifted and talented programs and to assess the effectiveness of current programs. Two separate issues are involved; therefore, the report shall address each in turn.

In regard to the first issue, the evaluator used the following general method in obtaining the information presented in this report. First, general information (SBER, Resource Manual for Gifted Programs, and the Plan) regarding gifted education in Florida was read. Then there was an analysis of each school district's procedures as submitted to the Bureau of Education of Exceptional Students. Each procedure was examined in order to obtain the following information:

1. Criteria for eligibility: tests used or authorized, kind of checklist used, documentation of need, other criteria used, "flags" for atypical gifted students.
2. Screening: referral devices, tests and cut-off scores.
3. Philosophy of program: acceleration, enrichment, career development, development of cognitive and affective skills.
4. Curriculum: elementary, middle, junior high, senior high.
5. Number of hours in program: elementary, middle, junior high, senior high.
6. Program delivery: resource center (bused in), fulltime basic, fulltime basic with consultative services, itinerant teachers, regular class with pull-out resource, fulltime gifted, advanced placement.
7. Program evaluation: teacher, student, parent, administrator, tests, other devices.

Items 1 and 2 deal with the first issue of minority representation raised by the Legislature; the remaining items are concerned with program effectiveness.

Membership in special programs is restricted by the law which defines "gifted" as "one who has superior intellectual development and is capable of high performance. The mental development of a gifted student is two (2) standard deviations of more above the mean." It is perhaps pertinent at this point to observe that the legislative mandate refers to Florida's gifted programs. The national revised definition of gifted and talented reads:

> "Gifted and talented children" means children and, whenever applicable, youth, who are identified at the preschool, elementary, or secondary level as possessing demonstrated or potential abilities that give evidence of high performance capability in areas such as intelligence, creativity, specific academic or leadership ability, or in the performing or visual arts, and who, by reason thereof, require services or activities not ordinarily provided by the school."

From this, it may readily be seen that Florida has selected a definition of gifted as one of intellectual ability. Talented, under this definition, is not represented in the state mandate. There are a number of obvious advantages to such a narrow approach. One, the State's financial resources are focused into an area traditionally reserved to the school, the development of the intellect. Two, when its definition is limited the population of the group will be reduced, and the quality of one program may be enhanced. Third, intellectual ability can be empirically measured by standardized tests with objective decisions as to who does and does not enter a program.

One disadvantage of a limited definition, however, is that which Florida is facing: low minority representation in gifted programs. Minority children, culturally different children, and the disadvantaged are not as likely to be identified on standard measures. Expert opinion as to possible causes and factors for this situation may be found in the review of

related literature, attached separately. The statistics themselves speak to the accuracy of such a statement: In 1981-82 only 6% of the membership in Florida's gifted programs represented the minority/culturally different.

The general screening devices employed by the school districts in order to conduct a search for the potentially gifted reflect measures appropriate for programs emphasizing academic aptitude. While all school districts did not report the exact measures used, approximately 95% described referrals for evaluation as based on a combination of achievement test scores (8th or 9th stanine), teacher observation, cumulative records, parent referral, etc.

Achievement tests measure precisely what the name states: Academic achievement within the context of specific subject matter such as social studies, math. To put it another way, an achievement test measures the skill or knowledge that an individual has gained as a result (presumably) of instruction and reading. Regardless of the subject matter, the student must be able to read and to comprehend the instructions, the questions, and the answers. Achievement tests become, therefore, a measure of a student's language skills. If a student, however innately bright he may be, has poor skills, the resulting scores will be low and perhaps not indicative of the student's real knowledge and/or ability in the area. Additionally, the student with a wider exposure to varied stimuli and learning experiences outside the school setting will likely score higher on a test and will appear to have "learned more" than his disadvantaged peer whose extra school enrichment has been minimal. Another problem in the use of achievement tests is in the scoring. The scores indicate the students' relative position in relationship to others. The critics of achievement tests held that the norms are based on the white middle class and that the minority student, while perhaps vastly superior to his peers within his/her minority group, may not score well in relationship to those outside the minority group.

In regard to teacher observation, it must be pointed out that this is one of the least reliable methods of referral. Research indicates that teachers nominate the high achievers, who make excellent grades and display approved social behaviors, not always the student identified as gifted. Furthermore, the usual checklist of such behaviors may not apply to the atypical (minority, culturally different, disadvantaged) gifted. The accompanying review of literature recalls some very real differences in the characteristics of the disadvantaged and the culturally different. These dissimilarities could result in such a child not scoring well on a measure intended for the "typical" gifted.

Nearly all the school districts reporting give a Slosson Intelligence Test (if not previously administered) after referral or an Otis Lennon Mental Ability Test. Cut-off scores for referral for additional psychological evaluation were, for the great majority, 130 and 125 respectively. Both the Slosson and the Otis-Lennon have been termed good predictors of school performance, because both measures are highly verbal in nature. Such tests, however, do not indicate potential, a factor pointed to in Florida's definition of gifted as one who is "capable of high performance".

From the review of the general screening practices used in the school districts, it is the opinion of the evaluator that said school districts are using methods appropriate to programs of academic aptitude. High general intellectual functioning should not be evaluated with academic excellence. A search for this characteristic does not appear to be evident in the procedures as given.

Approximately 16% of the school districts reporting are sensitive to the culturally different, the minority, the disadvantaged, and the underachieving. These districts report a "flag" or a look-out for said students as a part of their referral and/or screening process. This is, however, too small a representation to make any real statewide increase in minority

representation. One county did report a matrix approach for referral, a promising approach considered further in the annotated bibliography.

A more encouraging statistic lies in the tests used to determine intellectual functioning. A little over 50% report the use of either the verbal or performance scores on the Wechsler scales in special circumstances, the Leiter International Performance Scale (for the culturally different), non-English language tests such as The Barsit or Spanish WISC-R, or the SOMPA (System of Multi-Cultural Pluralistic Assessment which includes the WISC-R). All districts report testing students in native language, if indicated.

Only a few districts seem to address local concerns in regard to the required statement of "need for a special program." Many of the districts seem to feel that an IQ score demonstrated need. While such a need may be difficult to document in observable language, that very need lies at the heart of the justification for differential education for the gifted. The delivery of special services to the gifted should state clearly why the student needs the program.

Based upon the foregoing observations, the evaluator makes the following recommendations in regard to minority representation in gifted programs:

1. If Florida continues its definition of gifted as one of "superior intellectual development", the district screening procedures should be adjusted to reflect this definition.
2. Teacher observation and referral (in the traditional sense) should not be relied upon heavily.
3. The checklist of gifted characteristics used in the district should be carefully screened for allowance of the atypical gifted behaviors. Consideration should be given to the development of alternate checklists of behaviors peculiar to a particular group (see attached bibliography).
4. Districts who do not include provision for special test considerations for the underachieving/culturally different should do so.
5. Districts should address themselves to the problems of the need for special programs, especially for the atypical gifted.

Before turning to the second issue of program effectiveness, the evaluator wishes to note that there is no requirement in the district procedures that the districts report on all the items addressed in this report. A number of the districts, however, in the interest of clear communication, did report the number of teachers, the hours in the program at each level, the curriculum at each level, and the delivery of services at each level. These districts are to be commended, and the other districts are urged to follow this example of specificity. Because of the lack of clarity in many reports, the evaluation may be somewhat imprecise in certain areas.

Program philosophy in Florida is largely geared to the enhancement of cognitive/affective skills. Less than 5% mention acceleration as a goal, but a larger percentage than that (21%) did mention advanced placement or early college entrance courses. Enrichment is the philosophy espoused by 30% of the districts. Approximately 20% of the districts report a combination of philosophical approaches.

The curriculum across the educational levels is less clear. No report of any differential programs for kindergarten was made. Elementary and middle schools use the usual models such as Bloom, Guilford, and Renzulli. Most districts appear to use the learning center -unit study approach. Independent study is also mentioned. About 10% of the counties use the Duval County Curriculum Guide, a sequenced curriculum with criterion referenced tests to

measure progress. One county mentioned a teacher-made curriculum planned in connection with the students' IEPs; another developed a guide with the assistance of a parent council. A few schools report the use of SOI for a profile of strengths and weaknesses. At the junior high/high school level, there appears to be little in the way of differential programs. Most schools report honors courses, advanced placement, and the like. A few districts with nearby colleges have devised a system of early college admission. One county reported a sequence of study for the secondary level. Under 20% of the districts report having some type of mentor program. These programs varied from district to district in terms of hours spent but, at the minimum, the student spent several hours a week with someone in a profession or an executive capacity. A few districts mentioned the use of Thinkology and Computeronics. Group and individual counseling as an integral part of the curriculum were reported by several counties. Two districts referred to the cooperation and assistance of advocacy groups in providing special services.

Delivery of services is accomplished as follows: pull-out programs with a school-based resource room (77%), resource centers (40%), full-time basic class with consultation (22%), advanced placement (22%), and itinerant teachers (20%). Only one fulltime gifted program (grades 4-12) is reported.

Less than 50% of the school districts reported the number of hours per week in gifted programs. These schools appear to provide services one full day a week when the students attend a resource center and approximately 5 hours per week otherwise. High school students enrolled in internship or mentor programs might spend considerably more hours per week with the total hours dependent on the type of arrangement.

The reports on program evaluation indicate district reliance on questionnaires, checklists, or opinionnaires completed by the students and, sometimes, the teacher. Schools using the Duval County Curriculum report the use of CRTs (criteria referenced tests) to measure student progress. A number of the districts report observation as the means of evaluation with the principal and program director serving as the evaluators. Districts use the review of the students' IEP as an evaluation measure, but only one district reported objective criteria for student attainment. Some schools use grades and report cards. One district reported parent questionnaires; another considered the affective domain in its evaluation. No district reported a systematic system of data collection with tests and measuring instruments clearly set forth or a means of reporting the data to the public. No specific documentation appears to exist regarding student gains as a result of gifted programs.

The last statement reflects a specific concern of evaluation in regard to Florida's gifted programs: the lack of a clearly defined system of program evaluation. Given the depth of commitment to gifted education and the talent of those involved, this gap in the program can be remedied. The accompanying bibliography contains a number of concrete suggestions for ways to carry out adequate program evaluation.

The second major concern is in the area of the curriculum, especially at the secondary level. Few differential programs are reported. This concern is share by the school districts and the Bureau, as evidenced by the number of Challenge Grants awarded to secondary programs. If gifted secondary education concerns itself with only honors courses and advanced placement which are open to all students with academic strengths, it may find itself in a position of retreat. Those involved in the Challenge Grants are to be commended for facing this problem and seeking a solution.

Another curricular concern lies in the use of the IEP's. Does Florida wish to continue their use? If so, it would appear that more consideration of the IEP must be given, and this will require a greater in-depth individual assessment of each student than apparently is being

conducted at the present. If the IEP lies at the heart of the gifted education program, then special care must be taken to modify the overall gifted curriculum to each individual student's needs. The evaluator did not find evidence of this practice at the present time.

Florida is indeed to be commended for its desire to improve what is already one of the nation's outstanding gifted education programs. Such vision can only make what is good, better. It has been both an honor and a pleasure to have been involved in such an endeavor.

APPENDIX B

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHIES

Annotated Bibliography

Topic: Minority Representation in Gifted and Talented Programs

For: Gifted and Talented Study
Florida Department of Education
Division of Public Schools
Bureau of Education for Exceptional Students

Submitted by: Julia G. Moore

To: Deborah Bellflower, Consultant
Gifted Education

The following items address themselves to the question of:

What factors currently influence the membership in gifted and talented programs?

Bruch, C., Assessment of creativity in culturally different children. Gifted Child Quarterly, 1977, 21(2) 164-174.

Bruch identified these areas of concern in measurement of IQ and achievement as they relate to cultural differences.

1. IQ measures middle-class culture and values and does not address itself to minorities. The need, then, is to find and use measures where the focus is on the characteristics held in value by a particular culture as well as those of the mainstream culture.
2. Language modification needs to be made in standardized instruments in current use so that account may be made when a student gives a culturally - right but mainstream - wrong answer.
3. Educators, test administrators, and the testing instruments themselves are based in favor of traditional IQ and non-accepting of cultural pluralism and its measures as well as other cultural values.
4. Change must be made in the attitudes which hold that giftedness can only be measured by objectives measures, that IQ measures are valid and reliable for culturally different children, that IQ measures innate ability with no influence due to experience, and that IQ measures a unitary ability rather than a multi-intellectual approach.

Fitzgerald, E. J. (ed)., The First National Conference on the Disadvantaged Gifted. National/State Leadership Training Institute on the Gifted and Talented. Los Angeles, California, 1975. Ed 131-619.

(NOTE: this is an excellent summary of research, etc. in the area.)

Remarks by D. Sisk:
"Some of the most serious deficiencies in the disadvantaged child occur in the area of cognitive functioning, language skills, and reading.....Studies concerning disadvantaged children indicate that they are often apt to manifest a variety of linguistic disabilities such as limited vocabularies; and nonstandard grammar school records also indicate their incapacity in such cognitive processes as the ability to observe and state sequence of events, to perceive cause and effect relationships, or to group concrete phenomena into classes of phenomena.

"Presumably, individual potential is evenly distributed among all groups of people. If there are differences among groups with respect to functioning intelligence, the causes must be environmental conditions which inhibit or fail to facilitate the conversion of potential into functioning intelligence."

Gallagher:
"...If the values of the school favor the docile, task oriented, polite, verbal child who is adept at sensing adult needs and playing to them, then the culturally different child who may have a different life style, individual in its own way, may appear strange, stubborn, noncooperative, lazy, etc."

Recommendations for innovative procedures were:
Moreno recommends a criteria for selection (K-3) for the identification of mentally gifted chicano children in which the top 3% of these students in each school is selected by GPA, teacher evaluation in 11 areas, and achievement test scores.

Suggests teacher inservice as training for recognizing the characteristics of the culturally disadvantaged. Teachers had input into screening devices from their own observed behaviors.

Gallagher, J., The gifted child in elementary school in The Intellectually Gifted: An Overview. W. Dennis and M. Dennis (eds). New York: Grover and Stratton, 1976.

Gallagher noted the impact of superior socioeconomic status on proportions of school populations at various levels.

1. For IQ 130+ in an average community the percentage of gifted is 2-4%, but in a superior community it rises to 6-12%
2. At IQ 115 in an average community the percentage is 16-20% while in a superior community it is 45-60%.

So he recommends that a school administrator might wish to lower IQ cut off scores where lower socio economic differences prevail.

Gallagher, J., The gifted child in elementary school in The Intellectually Gifted: An Overview. W. Dennis and M. Dennis (eds). New York: Grover and Stratton, 1976.

This author observed that one cause of underachievement may be a reflection of the parents' anti-intellectual and anti-educational views.

Gallagher, J., Teaching the Gifted Child (2nd edition). Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1975.

The disadvantaged:

1. Interest and attitudes may differ in that disadvantaged tend to action and competition in sports.
2. More likely to play musical instruments and to want higher status occupations.
3. More home tension.
4. More likely to perform substantially below potential.

Reviewed research indicates that IQ may be affected by environment. A deprived background and circumstances will not yield that linguistic development necessary for success in a culture built on linguistic and verbal systems. The term "disadvantaged" will generally refer to persons weak in these skills. These students, however, frequently demonstrate fluent, flexible responses; nonverbal originality; adeptness at visual art activites, creativity in movement, dance, physical activity; strong attraction to games, music, sports, humor, concrete objects.

In an adaptation of work by Riessman, Gallagher delivered the special characteristics of the culturally different:

1. Physical and visual, rather than aural, learner
2. Content centered rather than form
3. Stimulated by concrete, external forces rather than introspective
4. Problem centered not abstract
5. Slow, careful and patient
6. Needing structure and control

Suggested Bruch's criteria for identification

1. Outstanding ability in one or more abilities valued by his culture as primary criterion.
2. Ability and achievement on standard identification measures at "bright-average" as a secondary criterion.
3. Special consideration for demonstrated creativity.
4. Special consideration for social leadership potential.

Gonzalez, G., Language, culture and exceptional children in Cultural Diversity and the Exceptional Child, G. Bransford, L. Baca and Karen Lave (eds), Reston, Virginia: CEC, 1973.

Gonzalez summarized these articles in regard to language: regardless of the cultural group language is a system of local sounds, is systematic, is symbolic, and undergoes constant change. Spoken language, therefore, is not innate, and all languages are "good".

Most IQ tests rely on language which is the standard English of the white middle class. Even translations should be in the dialect, not the overall language that the child speaks. Blacks often speak in special sentence forms or speech patterns.

Suggest that scores on traditional IQ measures be only 1 of the measures in assessment of minority students.

Havighurst, R., Conditions productive of Superior Children. Teachers College Record, 1961, 62, 524-531.

In summarizing studies of underachievement Havighurst draws the following conclusions:

1. Home environment may be emotionally inadequate in some ways and is often broken.
2. Homes tend to be from lower socioeconomic level.
3. The environment has failed to stimulate in the student a desire for educational excellence and a need for academic achievement.

Whitmore, J., Giftedness, Conflict, and Underachievement. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1980.

Points out that group intelligence tests such as the CTBS or Otis-Lennon will not identify all mentally gifted students but will, instead, point out the high achievers. Group tests rely on reading and following directions and are thus dependent on school learning. Of the individual IQ measures most widely used, the Binet primarily assesses vocabulary, comprehension, memory, some logic, and perception of relationships; the Wechsler scales assess the same abilities but add performance skills in such tasks as puzzles, picture completion, block design. Neither test identifies ability in specific subject matter; neither predicts social leadership or creativity - all a part of the USOE definition of gifted and talented.

The following items address themselves to the question of:

What factors could increase minority membership in gifted and talented programs?

Kirschenbaum, R., Let's cut out the cut-off score in the identification of the gifted. Roeper Review, 1983, 5(4), 6-9.

"Evidence has been presented to show that taken by themselves, each and every published method of identifying gifted and talented students is seriously flawed. Neither intelligence, achievement, nor creativity tests have shown predictive validity for adult productivity or success. There is also very little experimental evidence concerning the validity of

identification procedures and student outcomes or progress in gifted programs, and much of that is based on an inherently faulty design. While totally subjective and unsystematic identification procedures are by no means advocated, it is recommended that more reliance by placed on the use of locally designed and normed methods at the expense of test data."

Ketchum, W. A. and Daoud, M. R., How should the gifted be defined and identified? Innovator, 1976, 8, 10.

". . .the most dependable identification procedure is probably screening with a cut off score as low as possible . . . additional consideration can then be given to the inclusion of exceptions involving characteristics other than intelligence and cultural differences and teacher, parent, peer, and self-nominations. But the number of exceptions should be limited only after extremely careful and thorough case studies."

LeRose, B., A quota system for gifted minority children: a viable solution. Gifted Child Quarterly, 1978, 22, 394-403.

The Racine Public Schools set a quota system of proportionate numbers of white and minority students. Intervention was at the K-2 level because early identification is crucial.

Hewrsberger, J., and Asher, W., Comment on "A Quota System . . ." Gifted Child Quarterly, 1980, 24, 96.

While these authors agree educationally with the decision to use a quota system, they ask how does one choose the students to be included. If the measures used are not adequate initially, then their use cannot be justified as instruments in a quota system of selection.

Llanes, J., and Gurule J., Social and racial desegregation in gifted and talented education: The W.I.C. Magnet School experiment. Roeper Review, 1981, 4(2), 31-32.

The authors report on an experimental program which successfully identified a nearly equal number of black and white students for a gifted program. Nomination for the program was based on standardized tests scores, both state and local; Renzulli-Hartman Scale, performance in daily school activities. Student achievement is measured academically, socially and kinetically.

Richert, E. S., Alvino, J. J., and McDonnel, R. C., Assessment and recommendations for gifted and talented youth. Roeper Review, 1982, 5(2), 48.

This was a report on a national assessment of the procedures used to identify gifted and talented students in special services. "In spite of more than half the states' adoption of the broad federal definition, identification practices are often arbitrary, elitist and restrict services to academically achieving middle class students . . . In effect, many disadvantaged students . . . are being excluded from services."

Among the major recommendations of the study was that a variety of methods which go beyond measures of academic achievement must be employed in identification and that teachers and other educators must be trained to identify gifted and talented in a comprehensive and unbiased manner. Because of limits in funding and due to the need of a variety of program options, cost-effective approaches such as retraining of existing staff and modification of existing resources should be given top priority.

Sisk, D., Issues and future directions in gifted education. Gifted Child Quarterly, 1980, 24, 29-32.

". . . identification of the gifted should be started early, and should be a continuous process with the goal being identification of multiple talents. Under no circumstance should one instrument be utilized to identify gifted children, and the information sources should be as broad as possible - including parents, teachers, psychologists, peers, and the child."

Samuda, R. J., Psychological Testing of Minorities: Issues and Consequences. New York, Dodd, Mead, 1975.

Samuda pointed to the need for expansion and elaboration of psychometric approaches to the testing of minorities:

1. Culturally different are tested unfairly. (Note date of study.)
2. Test administrators need to be better trained and to be sensitive to the special problems of cultural diversity.
3. Need to use measures of environmental factors to supplement IQ scores.
4. Relevance of pluralistic models (such as SOMPA) for testing minorities so that individual characteristics are considered within the context of family and sociocultural group.
5. Need to develop norms which use the unique language features which are a part of some minority groups.
6. Instruments should be considered as a tool to describe and diagnose not to select and predict.

Vassar, W. G. (ed), Conn-Cept I: Practical Suggestions for Gifted and Talented Program Development. Hartford, Connecticut: Connecticut State Department of Education, 1979. Ed # 179-042.

Baldwin Identification Matrix is recommended for schools preferring a broader definition of giftedness. This matrix lists the assessments used combined with the scores earned. This presents a total score for the learner as well as the profile.

Renzulli urges for identification based on a wide variety of information. Present evidence indicates that the case study approach is less costly and is more sensitive to identifying academically able students in schools serving minority populations.

The following items address themselves to the question of:

What additional or different procedures or criteria should be considered for eligibility of students for gifted and talented programs?

Cummings, W. B., Cummings Checklist of Characteristics of Gifted and Talented Students. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: CEC, 1980 ERIC No. Ed. 187-065.

The checklist was evaluated with 516 elementary students. Teachers used the checklist to nominate students for the gifted program. CC items were taken from research as indices of minority gifted and talented children. Despite a lessening school population, the author reports an increase of over 200% minority membership in gifted/talented programs in the five years of using CC. Also, when group IQ scores were the screening measure, only about 30% of those screened and tested qualified; using CC, 68% were identified. (copy of instrument is in the document.)

Davis, P. I., Community-based Efforts to Increase the Identification of the Number of Gifted Minority Children. Eastern Michigan University: Ypsilanti, Michigan, ERIC 1981 No. 176-487.

This reports on a study done in Ypsilanti, Michigan where nominations for the gifted program were made by black community leaders who came in contact with middle school young black people, e.g. ministers, directors of athletic programs, scout masters, white leaders in touch with black youths. Referral was done by questionnaire to school principals. The three general areas were cognitive superiority, psycho-social superiority and talent-specific superiority. 66% of those identified demonstrated superiority in all areas. Fifteen students were identified as gifted.

Khatena, J., Educational Psychology of the Gifted. New York: John Wiley, 1982.

Khatena addressed himself also to the problem of the identification of the minority gifted and observed that the Torrance measures of creativity held the greatest promise in the identification of talent since studies indicate that these tests appear to assess abilities that are little influenced by hereditary abilities. Khatena does point out that Jensen, who has written and spoken on hereditary black-white differences, sees the racial differences as being one of the complexity not the content of the IQ measures and also as a matter of the developmental log of black youngsters behind their white peers.

Khatena spoke of the expanded concept of giftedness (USOE definition) which has led some in gifted education (Khatena himself among them) to contruct creativity indexes as indicators of giftedness. These are open-ended measures which permit the students to respond in terms of their own experiences and in whatever language or dialect they find comfortable.

LeCompte, M., Bordge, J., Kress, P., Pyper, J., Selig, H., Evaluation of the Vanguard Program: A New Approach to Assessment of Programs for the Gifted and Talented. Dallas, Texas, Southwest Educational Research Association, 1981, ED 204-938.

Vanguard is an interdisciplinary, multi-instructional level program which made traditional pre-post test designs inappropriate. It is a part of the magnet school program designed to achieve racial integration. Required racial ratio is 35% White and other and 65% Black and Hispanic. Students must demonstrate outstanding ability in 2 of the following areas: intellectual ability, creative thinking, leadership potential.

Evaluation is in the form of ethnography. Ethnographies are analytical descriptions or reconstructions of intact cultural scenes and groups which delineate the shared beliefs, practices, folk knowledge and behaviors of some groups of people.

At the time of publication, this approach was in the planning stage, and the document outlined the proposed steps. If the timeline was followed, the yearly plan should be complete and the district ready to share its complete procedures.

Maker, C. J., Curriculum Development for the Gifted. Rockville, Maryland: Aspen Systems Corporation, 1982.

Recognition of the characteristics of atypical gifted can lead to a readier identification of these students. Maker distinguished between the two factors of culture and socioeconomic status.

Characteristics of children of lower economic status:

1. Weakness in knowledge and vocabulary due to lack of exposure to reading materials and information.
2. Strengths in observational skills and memory or recall, creativity and leadership.
3. Motivation appears to decrease during school years. Tendency to depend on external motivators and to attribute success to luck rather than ability.

Characteristics of black students:

1. (Note: This study done with all disadvantaged subjects) low in cognition, evaluation, convergent production, figural content, and semantics; strengths in mastery and recall.
2. Tendency to excel in physical activities, sociability.
3. Strengths in arithmetic and digit span and abstract reasoning independent of semantics.
4. Tendency to lose early motivation and to show weaknesses in task commitment; need for external motivation.

Maker, C. J., Curriculum Development for the Gifted. Rockville, Maryland: Aspen Systems Corporation, 1982.

Reported on an experimental program for early childhood designed to meet the needs of potentially gifted students in an inner city area. Because of the low school achievement in the area, the staff concluded that few students would be identified in the traditional fashion. Potential giftedness was defined as performance significantly above the norm in any one or more of the areas of general intellectual ability, creativity, and leadership.

Screening devices were vision, hearing, home bilingual usage estimate; parent interview; oral language, speech and hearing screening (OGSH); Boehm test of Basic Concepts; peer referral interview; TTCT - figural; teacher referral checklist; observation; Benal Checklist with parents and teachers; Draw-A-Person; and Otis-Lennon. After this information was collected, frequency distributions and means were computed. A weighting system was devised and a matrix was developed to determine the children to be referred for additional testing.

This assessment consisted of the Leiter International Performance Scale, a nonverbal test of intelligence used for children whose dominant language in not English. Other students were tested with the Wechsler scales. A second measure, given in either English or Spanish, was the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, an assessment of receptive language. This information was combined with certain of the screening data to form a second matrix. Eighteen students were admitted to the program. The author reported a high degree of success for the children who participated in this program. (for further information see Maker, C. J., Morris, E., and James, J. The Eugene field project: A program for potentially gifted young children.) In Balancing The Scale for the Disadvantaged Gifted. Los Angeles; National/State Leadership training Institute on the Gifted and Talented, 1981.

Rivera, R., The Nondiscriminatory Assessment of the Gifted Bilingual Child. New Orleans, Louisiana: CEC, 1981, ED 204-874.

School psychologists recommend the use of the SOMPA with all appropriate children, even the white. While rarely using the SOMPA in its entirety, he always employs the socio-cultural scales. This assesses a child's estimated level of potential while gauging her/his school functioning level. He expresses the belief that such social factors as family size, family structure, economic status, and urban acculturation have more to do with test performance than ethnicity.

Thompson, C. P., The Development and Implementation of Elementary School Gifted Program Guidelines. Nova University, 1975, ED 117-906.

Reports the use of a checklist devised by San Mateo County, California to identify culturally disadvantaged and underachieving. Evidence of disadvantage could be environmental, language, cultural, and/or economic. When students score above the cut-off in one of these areas, a section on underachievement is filled in: 5 "yes" responses out of 8 indicate

underachievement. When a student is rated as both disadvantaged and underachieving, a screening committee examines student behaviors for evidence of giftedness.

Taylor, C. W., Teaching For Talents and Gifts 1978 Status - Developing and Implementing Multiple Talent Teaching. Washington, D. C.: National Institute of Education, 1978, ED 172 475.

The multiple talent approach looks beyond academic and creative talent. It believes that all children have a talent.

One elementary school reported a follow-up study when students were in junior high. On 19 or 20 variables former special program students surpassed the matched control group.

A number of districts which use the multiple talents approach use the decision-making talent as the focus for career education development.

Torrance, E. P., Discovery and Nurturance of Giftedness in the Culturally Different. Reston, Virginia: CEC, 1977.

Torrance saw an urgent need for talent identification among the disadvantaged and the culturally different student. His approach has been non-psychometric and is based on the rationale of creative positives. He lists these following characteristics of creative positives.

1. Ability to express feelings and emotions.
2. Ability to improvise with common place materials and objects.
3. Articulateness in role playing, sociodrama, and story telling.
4. Enjoyment of and ability in visual arts, such as drawing, painting and scupture.
5. Enjoyment of and ability in creative movement, dance, dramatics, and so forth.
6. Enjoyment of and ability in music, rhythm and so forth.
7. Use of expressive speech.
8. Fluency and flexibility in figural media.
9. Enjoyment of and skills in group activities, problem solving etc.
10. Responsiveness to the concrete.
11. Responsiveness to the kinesthetic.
12. Expressiveness of gestures, body language, and so forth, and ability to interpret body language.
13. Humor
14. Richness of imagery in informal language.
15. Originality of ideas in problem solving.
16. Problem centeredness or persistence in problem solving.
17. Emotional responsiveness.
18. Quickness of warm-up.

Annotated Bibliography

Topic: Program Effectiveness in Gifted and Talented Programs

For: Gifted and Talented Study
Florida Department of Education
Division of Public Schools
Bureau of Education for Exceptional Students

Submitted by: Julia G. Moore

To: Deborah Bellflower, Consultant
Gifted Education

The issue of the effectiveness of current programs for the gifted and talented raises the very real problem in the area of evaluation raised in the report on district procedures. Until evaluation practices are upgraded, it is difficult to give clear answers to the questions raised. Alternative programming was examined somewhat in the bibliography on minority representation.

The following items address themselves to the general areas of the effectiveness of programs in the gifted and the current recommendations as to program validation and assessment.

Colby Public Schools, Colby, Kansas.

Reported on at NAGC, this school district has recently completed a thorough program evaluation of its gifted and talented program. A copy of the procedures may be obtained for $5.00.

Carr, R. A., Goal Attainment scaling as a useful tool for evaluating progress in special education. Exceptional Children, 1979, 46, 88-95.

Too often reports in effectiveness of programs point to numbers observed, personnel, types of programs - not to whether the programs achieved their goals. Goal attainment scaling (GAS) focuses on outcomes and measures individual progress as well as class or program achievement.

GAS is similar to behavioral objectives in that goals are specified but in GAS the specified outcomes are placed on a 5 point continuum with each position representing the degree of achievement of the goal.

Fundamentals of GAS are:

1. Goals must be mutually determined by the persons involved. (Student, parent, teacher, principal)
2. Goals must be assigned relative weights - also by mutual determination - to total 100.
3. Outcome behaviors must be perceived as best guesses as to what behavior can be expected. These are also arranged on a 5 point continuum for better than expected to worse than expected.
4. A scoring system must be developed.

The article gives specific examples of a goal attainment scale, baseline data, and calculations of attainment level.

Evans, E. D., and Marken, D., Multiple outcome assessment of special class replacement for gifted students: A comparative study. Gifted Child Quarterly, 1982, 26, 126-132.

Set up 2 comparable groups: on subjects in special classes for the gifted and the other gifted students with regular age-grade placement. This provided a basis for real comparison.

Issues and implications for gifted education evaluation:

1. While the thrust of the program is clear (nurturance of higher order cognitive processes and skills), there is a real lack of specificity or precision in formulating program objectives. This creates great difficulties in measurement.

2. Program evaluation needs to encompass implementation study: Did the intended treatment occur? How adequately, competently, or completely was the intended program delivered?
3. Gifted education must consider Berin's "goal-free" evaluation. What were the unintended (positive and negative) outcomes of the program? Example: What is the impact on students not selected for the program?

Gallagher, J., The gifted child in elementary school in The Intellectually gifted: An Overview. W. Dennis and M. Dennis (eds). New York: Grosse and Stratton, 1976.

Gallagher cited results of studies comparing special program gifted with those equally bright but not enrolled in special programs. Results are usually favorable to special program gifted.

Ganapole, S. J., Measuring the outcomes of gifted programs. Roeper Review, 1982, 5(1), 4-7.

The author states at the outset that gifted educators must set precise, measurable objectives.

Traditional assessment instruments:
1. Questions and checklists do not measure changes in learning behavior or performance. They do, however, give insight into aspects of a program and its nature of course offerings, administrative support, but do not give data on the students progress in meeting objectives.
2. Norm referenced (NR) tests are also used frequently.
   a. Content of NR tests are unlikely to meet that on content, skills, and abilities in gifted programs.
   b. Based on desire to rank and compare individuals. While excellent in some purposes, this does not tell whether the program has been effective.
   c. Many NR tests are designed to give data for the mid-range of ability. They may not be valid for the upper end of normal curve where increases will be more difficult to show.

Two suggestions or recommendations are made:
1. Criterion referenced tests (CRT) describe behaviors and set terms by which a teacher can measure CRT attainment. Do not rank, but reflect objectives and CRTs should be constructed by teachers. The author suggests the use of inservice, release time, shortened days, and extra money for extra time, in order to give teachers time to develop these measure. At the beginning assistance with test development should be given by experts in measurement.
2. Alternate assessment strategies should be devised to measure diverse objectives. They should include those with constructed response: essay, oral exam, or performance of a task (criteria for scoring set in advance). Constructed response items measure the higher taxonomic levels.

(Note: An additional article by this author on the writing of clear, measurable objectives is Ganapole, S. J. The specification of objectives of gifted programs. Roeper Review, 1982, 4(4), 26-27.

Gear, G., Effects of training on teachers' accuracy in the identification of gifted children. Gifted Child Quarterly, 1978, 22, 90-97.

Teachers are frequently asked to assist in the identification of gifted students. These

referrals are relatively inaccurate. This experimental study used a training packet and a five - session series on such topics as the characteristics of gifted children. Teachers who participated in this training were twice as effective in making referrals as was the control group, and their referrals were more accurate.

George, W. C., The talent-search concept: An identification strategy in the intellectually gifted. Journal of Special Education, 1979, 13, 221-237.

This article reports on talent search at Johns Hopkins University a method of identifying academically gifted students in the areas of mathematical and verbal reasoning ability. Identification is in 2 steps: 1) top 2%-5% of achievement tests results as a screening device and 2) scholastic aptitude test (SAT) - mathematics and/or verbal (7th and 8th graders). The latter battery may be varied but care must be taken to select an instrument which is too complex to be coached. Cost of the program is reported at approximately $10 per child, considerably less than that for the usual gifted program.

A handbook for gifted program evaluation. Draft. Springfield, Illinois: Illinois State Office of Education. 1977. Ed 150-770.

3 main stages in program development cycle: planning, implementation, evaluation.

Planning:
1. What does program intend to accomplish?
2. How will it go about accomplishing this?
3. What will be the benefits to students?

If one is very clear about intended outcomes then it will be easier in the evaluation phase to see if the program has achieved these outcomes.

Implementation: formative evaluation
1. Are things going as planned?
2. Are changes and modifications needed?
3. Are the appropriate students being identified?
3. Are students motivated by program materials?

Evaluation:
1. Is the program achieving its objectives?
2. How well are the component parts working?

"Ideally, gifted programs should specify at least two types of outcomes. They should make a difference in student behavior in the area of giftedness which they address, and they should incur positive attitudes on the part of students, teachers, parents, and administrators. If your gifted program is content accelerated in nature, student behavior might be measured in terms of growth or progress through the subject matter. If our gifted program is enrichment oriented, student behavior might be measured in terms of quality of products or project produced."

A sound evaluation design should include:
1. Performance objectives - outcomes of the program in terms of students, parents, administration, staff. Should include individual exhibiting the behavior, the behavior, and the objective of the behavior.
2. Measurement devices - names or descriptions of instruments.
3. Continuum levels - statement of successful degree of attainment of objective.
4. Data collection schedule - timeline.
5. Data analysis procedure - How the data will be analyzed.

This document contains a number of sample instruments.

Painter, F., in Gifted Children. Gibson, J. and Channels, P. (eds). London, Watimer, 1976.

No differential programs for the gifted exist in the United Kingdom.

He compared a sample of identified gifted students with a control group of average bright with the exception of IQ, the subjects were paired. Underachievement occured in 28% of the gifted while in only 9% of the average-bright. The finding was significant and suggests the real need for differential programming.

Renzulli, J., A Guidebook for Evaluating Programs for the Gifted and Talented. Ventura County Superintendent of Schools: California, 1975. Ed 119-426.

Special problems in gifted and talented evaluation are:

A. Presence of higher level objectives which are difficult to measure easily and precisely.
B. IEP's for the student. (The author is opposed to the use of behavioral objectives in gifted programs and believes that it forces its concern for easily measured behaviors.)
C. Measurement and statistical problems in the use of standardized tests because of gifted student's scores at high range where gains appear to be slowed because norms were done on "normal" population - "Regression to the mean" may also occur.
D. Points out the real need for evaluation to be considered an integral part of the program from its inception. Serious attention must be paid to and resources allocated for evaluation procedures. There may also be problems with evaluation as seen as harsh, judgmental, or dictatorial.

Product evaluation:

1. Tests: standardized (NRT) and CRT
2. Attitudinal tests/surveys
3. Logs, checklist, school records of "frequency counts"

Process evaluation:

1. Systematic observation instruments
   a. teachers - flanders interaction analysis
   b. students - student rating: class activities questionnaire.

Intrinsic evaluation: Renzulli and Ward's DESEG model has a chapter devoted to the decision making process and the four steps in developing an evaluation design.

Stanley, J., Educational Psychologist, 1973, 10, 133-146.

This study took academically gifted (math) largely 6th graders. They were given 18 hours of instruction in advanced math - algebra, plane geometry, trig, analysis geometry. Tested on standard measure of achievement in algebra, all but 4 scored 60-99th percentile.

Storms, W. W., Cost effectiveness for gifted and talented education. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State Department of Education. 1975. Ed 112-550.

Cost effectiveness, in this study, implies the same concept as accountability. Goals are set to provide benefits, and objectives are fashioned to meet goals. "Cost effective analyses are designed to measure the extent to which resources (costs) allocated to a specific objective under each of several alternatives actually contribute to accomplishing that objective so that different ways of gaining the objective may be compared."

Cost effectiveness is determined by dividing the average increase in test score by cost per pupil.

$$\text{Cost effectiveness} = \frac{\text{Average increase in test scores}}{\text{total cost per pupil}}$$

Schools may wish to pursue a multiple variable approach:
Student Achievement: CRT or NRT
Student Attitudes: Self concept or attitude scale
Parent Attitude: Questionnaire or other attitude scale
Community Input: Quantifiable, measurable opinion scale
Teacher Opinion: Quantifiable, measurable opinion scale

Raw scores can be conciled to means and standard scores. Weight or value can then be assigned to the criteria, if desired. Weighted scores are summed to yield a total score. This value may be used in the ratio formula.

Tremaine, C., Do gifted programs make a difference? Gifted Child Quarterly, 1979, 23, 500-517.

Study compared gifted high school graduates who had participated in special programs with gifted graduates who had not participated. Results:
1. Enrolled gifted had significantly higher GPA and SAT scores than unenrolled.
2. Enrolled gifted had nonsignificantly more scholarships and awards.
3. Enrolled gifted were more likely to elect different, challenging classes.
4. Enrolled gifted had higher educational goals and more regard for students and teachers.
5. Enrolled gifted were more involved in school activities.

"The study provided no data to support the contention that gifted programs breed elitism, snobbery, indifference, conceit, or any other negative quality. On the contrary.... The conclusion is that gifted programs do indeed make a difference - and that difference makes program development and participating vitally worthwhile."

Thompson, C. P., The development and implementation of elementary school gifted program guidelines, Nova University, 1975, Ed # 117 906

"It is important that school site personnel develop their own idiosyncratic to syncratic learning objectives and activities which meet the desired learning content of a particular community."

Evaluation was conducted by:
1. Process evaluation - A series of informal interviews with children, parents, teachers, and administrators where the writer had questions in mind which were used in various forms to encourage the interviewee to express opinions. Interview comments were grouped by category and reported in tabular form.
2. Product evaluation - Each activity or unit was rated by children, teachers, and parents as "liked it", "O.K.", "waste of time." Those units rating the most positive responses were those with pupil involvement or participation of some type. Those activities which were quiescent or audience type received the fewest positive responses.

In this program the district's instructional goals were used as references from which more specific gifted program objectives were developed. The local school selected 4-5 program objectives and translated these into learner objectives. Specific learner objectives were written to tell what learning would take place, at what level it would occur, and under what

conditions it would take place. The activities were the tasks the children performed in order to acquire the learning stated in the objective and were defined in writing. An explanation of the ways that the activity was qualitatively different from that of the regular school program also was stated in the written plan.

With objectives written behaviorally, methods of evaluation were easily developed by site personnel. Criteria used to assess the program were set in advance. (This document includes sample of written plans.)

Werts, R., and Kester, D., The Design, evaluation, and educational program audit of a district-wide K-12 mentally gifted minority program. Rowlands Heights, California: Rowland School District. 1975, Ed No, 115-061.

"An educational program audit is a performance control process based upon external review conducted by qualified outside consultants. It is designed to verify the results of the evaluation of an educational program and to assess the appropriateness of evaluation procedures used for determining the effectiveness of the operation and management of the program." This reports on the procedures used to develop such an audit program. Such a procedure separates the person responsible for the implementation of the program from its evaluation. Personnel for the program audit were obtained from the Division of Program Evaluation, Research and Pupil Services of the Los Angeles County Superintendent of Schools Office.

Appendix C

Commission Papers:
Increasing Minority Representation in Programs for the Gifted and Characteristics of the Home Environment of Potentially Gifted Minority Children

by

Dr. Mary Frasier
Associate Professor
University of Georgia

Since the formal inception of programs for the education of gifted children in American schools, minorities - especially Blacks - have been minimally represented. Despite the signal efforts of researchers and writers such as Dr. W. E. B. Dubois, Dr. Martin E. Jenkins, and Dr. Horace Mann Bond, the recognition that Blacks are capable of the level of achievement generally required to participate in gifted programs has been infrequently acknowledged. Yet there is glaring evidence, as exemplified by the vast number of adult achievers that many gifted black children and youth do indeed exist.

What, then, are the problems? If there are, indeed, black children with gifted potential why are we not finding them? Why do they appear so difficult to find?

Three difficulties immediately come to mind. The first can be attributed to the longitudinal study by Lewis E. Terman that included less than 1 percent of blacks in its sample. This study also contained strong negative assertions regarding the genetic inferiority of Blacks and certain other minorities.

The genetic inferiority theme has appeared over the years in various ways. So deeply imbedded is it that Clark (1983) observed that

> A major problem encountered in providing for gifted students among the disadvantaged (a frequently used euphemism for Blacks) is the attitude shared by teachers and parents alike, that giftedness could not exist in lower-class (another frequently used label for Blacks) populations (p. 333).

The final difficulty is that the findings regarding black giftedness as reported by researchers and writers such as DuBois, Jenkins and Bond has largely been ignored by writers and researchers. The purpose of this paper is to discuss ways of increasing minority representation in gifted programs by suggesting ways to eradicate these and other difficulties.

Approaches that Won't Work

Over the years various approaches have been suggested to solve the problem of minority representation in gifted programs. Examples of some of these suggestions and brief reasons why they won't work follow. Fuller discussions of these approaches will be included in later sections of this paper.

Using language or procedures that imply a lowering of the standards used to admit "other" potentially gifted students is not the answer. Though it is often reported that minority students, especially Blacks, score lower on standardized tests than their nonminority counterparts, an arbitrary adding of points to make up the deficit is not the answer. This approach would, at best, symbolize an artificial solution to complicated psychometric problems that may be caused by the inadequacies of tests.

"Other" shall be used to refer to those students admitted to gifted programs using traditional procedures (i.e., IQ scores, achievement test scores, and teacher recommendations) as infallible measures of gifted potential. In addition, the act of "lowering standards" creates more problems than it solves.

Adding a "talents" dimension to a state or a district's definition of who will be served only sidesteps issues and perpetuates the notion of minority inferiority. This approach not only implies that minority children are not gifted academically but it also demeans the efforts that should be made to identify children in areas other than those presumed to be measured by intelligence tests.

For example, the recent National Report on Identification (Richert, and McDonnel, 1982) concluded that

> ". . . 'gifted' was taken to apply only to the first category of general intellectual ability (in the 1971 U. S. Office of Education Report) and 'talented' erroneously to refer to the other, implicitly less able, 'second class' or not quite 'gifted students.'" (p. 115)

Using preparatory programs to try and bring minority students up to the IQ cut-off score set for admission to gifted programs is also not the answer. Besides the fact that these efforts usually don't work, they don't respond to the real problem of the inadequacy of the IQ as a single determiner of gifted potential. Efforts such as this also further indicate to minority students that "something is wrong with them."

Using language that suggests that minority children should be identified according to abilities valued and emphasized by "their culture" is an example of another approach that doesn't work. Gifted children are said to be those that have capabilities that far exceed the average. In addition, since it is expected that they are more likely to assume adult leadership roles, they must be prepared to participate in world affairs that transcend boundaries of ethnic group or race. Identifying minority children according to cultural values immediately serves to limit their potential to develop the broader skills of leadership required outside of any one cultural group.

These and other such approaches generally won't work because they represent temporary panaceas to parts of the problem. Any approach that is destined to work should be true to two fundamental premises undergirding programs for the gifted: (1) The efforts are aimed at locating those children who have the potential to excel at the upper end of an ability continuum and (2) Gifted children can be identified in all groups within our society.

Relevant Traits of Gifted Minority Children

A fairly standard practice in the screening and selection process for gifted programs is to ask teachers to nominate students whom they feel belong. Teachers are usually supplied with a list of characteristics in the form of a rating scale to aid them in the evaluation of potential candidates. Many lists have been developed, some based on research and some on observation. Terman's logitudinal study of gifted children is the genesis of many of the items on rating scales. Because minority children were not appreciably included in the devising of these rating scales, it can be said that they do not provide descriptors of giftedness among minority groups.

What, then, are the traits that distinguish the minority gifted child? In order to answer this question some researchers have identified areas of strengths among the disadvantaged. For example, by using an abbreviated version of the Stanford-Binet, Bruch (1971) identified the following areas of strengths of the disadvantaged: visual and auditory figural content (e.g., art and music); memory; convergent production in practical problem-solving situations; awareness of details in descriptions; fluency of ideas; spontaneous categorization and classification of spacial items; and awareness of natural relationships or systems.

Torrance (1969, p. 75) believed that there were certain creative strengths among the disadvantaged. He has identified a list of creative positives he feels are indicative of the talent among the disadvantaged. Included are traits such as: high nonverbal fluency and originality; high creative productivity in small groups; adept in visual art activities; highly creative in movement, dance, and other physical activities; highly motivated by games, music, sport, humor, and concrete objects; and language rich in imagery. In suggesting that these traits be sought, Torrance was responding to his delineation of the basic issues that should determine how we seek the disadvantaged gifted. These issues in the form of questions are:

> "Should we seek to identify and cultivate those kinds of talents that the dominant society values, or look for talents of the type that are highly valued in the particular subculture? Are there important kinds of talents commonly existent among disadvantaged subcultures?" (1969, p. 73)

In efforts to differentiate between lower and upper class gifted students, Frierson (1965) found that they differed in the quantity and quality of their reading, in their awareness of parental aspirations for college attendance, in their positive attitudes toward school, and in their preference for school sports. However, Frierson also found that lower class children, placed in a special program based on their giftedness by the second grade, differed markedly in achievement, attitudes, aspirations from other lower class gifted children by the time they reached the upper grades.

Sisk (1973) stated that the most serious deficiencies of the disadvantaged gifted are related to their cognitive functioning. For example, they lack the ability to observe and state sequences of

events, to perceive cause and effect relationships, and to categorize. She also feels that they possess deficiencies in language skills (e.g., limited vocabularies and nonstandard grammar), and reading.

Riessman's report on the culturally different child (1962) described their differences in learning style. He concluded that they were spatial - not temporal; physical - not aural; content centered - not form centered; inductive - not deductive.

The above findings are typical of the literature descriptions of the disadvantaged children. Clark (1983) concluded that it would be difficult to plan for characteristically gifted children when disadvantaged children are also in the program. She also concluded that such

> "deficits may result in classroom behavior we seldom associate with gifted students: negative attitudes toward school, toward teachers, and toward their own achievement; inability to focus on long-term goals; and the use of violence in resolving problems" (p. 335).

Such descriptions of the disadvantaged make the identification of the "disadvantaged gifted" very complex. Yet identify them we must!

As long as we view minority students as a monolithic subpopulation the problem of locating minority gifted children will continue to be complex. Frasier (1980) suggested that one way to simplify the problem is to classify the students in minority populations so that a more focused search can occur. As long as minority populations are considered as an homogenous group, inappropriate procedures will continue to be applied. She offered the following categories:

Student A

This culturally diverse gifted student comes from a middle class home where the parents are well educated and hold high educational aspirations for their children. Students of this type have attended good schools where they were superior academic performers. They are mature, well adjusted, and goal oriented. They also have confidence that they can accomplish their goals.

Student B

This student comes from a lower class but well organized home. Despite socioeconomic handicaps, the parents hold high aspirations for their children to achieve academically and occupationally. Parents are active encouragers and reinforcers of educational pursuits. Sacrifices are made in order that their children may have certain educational opportunities. Students of this type have high aspirations, and are usually confident that they can achieve their goals.

Student C

This student comes from a working class home. The parents express a desire for their children to obtain an education though they may lack the skills to assist them. Achievers from this type of environment are usually well cared for and have a positive self image. They are confident that they can achieve, although their aspirations may be somewhat narrow.

Student D

This student comes from the kind of lower class home typically described in research literature. The parents have little education; the father is usually absent; the mother usually works at a low level job; and there are often a large number of siblings.

There is a limited educational tradition in the home, and the day-to-day preoccupation with survival tends to divert attention away from planning for the future.

Implications

Culturally diverse gifted students like Student A should have very little difficulty fitting into traditional programs for the gifted. Their abilities and experiences will be very much like those of other high achievers who come from similar backgrounds, regardless of race or ethnic group.

The motivation to excel is a typical characteristic of Students B and C. The achievement of both is above average, with Student B possibly achieving at levels closer to Student A. Both of these students may face problems if teachers base expectations for their performance on assumptions they make about low socioeconomic environment. It is most important that they be given opportunities to demonstrate their true abilities to perform.

The attitude of Student C will be an important factor to consider when implementing gifted programs. The level of motivation exhibited by students of this type will depend upon the degree to which the educational environment is perceived to be responsive to their efforts to perform according to their capabilities.

Students of this type described as Student D present the greatest challenge. Greater efforts will have to be expended to provide new and broader experiences for them. Many opportunities will need to be provided through which their ability to achieve is encouraged and supported (pp. 59-60).

Another approach is to consider the findings of studies that have focused on minority groups to determine characteristics of achievers rather than continue to modify, adapt, or adopt traits of nonminority groups. There have been only a few studies of this type. Findings from only one are cited here.

In 1970 Glaser and Ross conducted a study concerned with successful persons from seriously disadvantaged backgrounds. From literary and survey analysis they identified fourteen traits that can be used to distinguish disadvantaged achievers from nonachievers. These traits are listed below:

IDENTITY: Having a strong sense of self, pride, and worth.

ALIENATION: Experiencing some degree of detachment from the confines of their immediate environment.

FREEDOM FROM CONDITIONING: Exhibiting a kind of freedom from routine brainwashing normally succumbed to by others (i.e., escape from those routines of thinking and acting that produce a sense of guilt, inferiority, limited perspective, absence of hope and the like).

PHYSICAL REMOVAL: Exhibiting the ability to break dependency ties with social norm pressures.

LUCK: Exhibiting the ability to benefit from occurrences which help them to find constructive outlets and relationships.

SUPPORTIVE, INSPIRING RELATIONSHIPS: Receiving assistance from special people who believe in them, guide them, and stand for a new set of standards.

IDENTIFICATION MODELS: Identifying with "folk heroes" and even ordinary people who symbolize identities other than disadvantaged.

QUESTIONING ORIENTATION: Asking at critical points in formative years, such as "Who am I?" or "Where am I going?"

AWARENESS OF ALTERNATIVE PATHS: Discovering that there are other routes than being a slave or hustler. Such goals as self-determination, money, creativity, or status become attractive to them. Actions such as hard work or studying become seen as steps that pay off.

NEW PERCEPTION OF SELF: Sees himself as someone not locked into one fixed negative or limited identity; envisions self as having potential for being a person different from what he is now.

EXISTENTIAL CRISIS: Dramatic encounter of clear-cut choices and new ways. Confronted a crisis head-on and resolved through a higher form of self and world affirmation.

RISK-TAKING CAPACITY: Being willing to endure the anxiety, suspense, disappointment and humiliation of experimenting with new behaviors.

CHANNELING OF RAGE: Learning to direct the rage over being disadvantaged into strategic actions effectively designed to fight one's way out of the ghetto; avoids burying one's anger beneath defenses of passivity and self-deprecation, or firing it out at the world impulsively in ways that provoke punishment.

REWARDS FOR CHANGE: Receive support and acceptance for new behavior and identity from key individuals, new peer groups, or internalized images.

Finally, Hirsch and Costello (1970) conducted an important study "to explore the spectrum of personality dimensions in a group of black innercity children, to relate the observed personality characteristics to academic performance in fifth grade, and to compare achievers and underachievers - boys and girls - in the black lower-class group." (p. 81). A significant departure from most studies was that Hirsch and Costello compared the children with their peers rather than with white middle-class agemates. Findings pertinent to locating potentially gifted minority students follow.

Language development. There was no difference in language development as evidenced by quality of speech and syntax among achievers and underachievers. However, among achieving boys especially, it was noted that "their speech was not nearly so outstanding as their ability to use language as a tool in problem-solving" (p. 82).

There was no special difference between achievers and underachievers in relationship to cognitive development as manifested in visual perception, auditory discrimination, awareness of time and space, and understanding of logical relationships. But achievers tended to be better organized in their approach to learning tasks.

Even though they were responsive to external rewards, achievers exhibited an internal locus of control. They derived great satisfaction from reaching internalized goals. Achieving girls were more motivated by external approval.

Not only did achievers of both sex have a solid definition of themselves, and evaluated themselves positively, but they also demonstrated a high degree of interpersonal skills. Achievers also gave evidence of intense relationships with caretaking figures (usually their parents). These significant others defined the children as "special" and they were likely to be more consistent and supportive. The achievers also viewed these significant others as being competent. It was interesting that achieving girls also identified with competent (usually professional) women outside of the family.

Achieving minority boys and girls demonstrated a greater capacity for individual initiative, for setting reasonable goals, and for following through to completion. They were more adequate in most areas of personality functioning and scored higher on a rating of overall mental health.

A most surprising finding related to their fear of failure. Whereas underachievers were immobilized by failure achievers were often stimulated to greater effort and subsequent success. This is contrary to the reported reaction to fear of failure among nonminority students.

Though the studies dealing with achievers among minority groups are limited, these exemplary studies at least suggest a more culture-

specific approach. The development of rating scale items based on literary and research findings such as these should allow us to make more accurate observations.

In the 1971 U.S.O.E. Report the problems of identifying the gifted from minorities and diverging cultures is described as being complicated by assumptions that talents cannot be found as abundantly in certain groups as in others - with the emphasis heavily in favor of the affluent. The report further suggested that these assumptions may have influenced meager search and identification among other groups. While an exact cause for these assumptions cannot be stated, a positive relationship between status and achievement expectations has often been reported.

Gifted children are often described as coming from high socioeconomic groups with well-educated parents who provide a stimulating and supportive home environment. Books and educational toys are abundantly available and trips to museums and other educational activities are frequent. Overall, the atmosphere in the home is said to be intellectually stimulating and supportive.

Children from homes that don't have these obvious advantages are usually felt to be less successful in school and are infrequently thought of as candidates for gifted programs. Minority children, especially Blacks, most often come from nomes that don't have these advantages because their parents are most often involved in lower social and economic occupations. Comparatively, minority group parents tend also to be lower than nonminority groups in educational attainments.

The results are that "researchers and scholars attribute much of the underachievement of low-income black students to their 'characteristics'. . . these 'characteristics' are traced to the family background and to the general environment in which low-income blacks are reared." (Hood, 1973, 312.)

The low socioeconomic status of minority students has been heavily emphasized as a variable affecting their ability to achieve. Reissman's (1962) very popular book on The Culturally Deprived Child became a popular source of information on the low income child and has done much to crystallize attitudes regarding the learning capacity of these children. Teachers and other educators, thus, have been indoctrinated in thinking that low-income, or minority children have certain educational limits. It is no wonder that the assumption persists that there are no gifted children among minority populations. The following discussion presents some relevant research regarding the effects of the home environment on achievement especially as it relates to minorities. A reeducation of teachers and others regarding findings such as these would be invaluable in removing their focus from irrelevant social status factors that hinder the identification of minority gifted students. It should also retard the efforts to only look at "talent categories" as the only area where minority children with potential can be found.

The oft reached conclusion is that the lower socioeconomic status of minority children which results in disadvantaged environments obscures

the discovery of gifted children. But, have we considered the appropriate home variables to reach this conclusion of cause which would, thus, effect our ability to find gifted children among minority group children and youth? I think not.

As Frierson (1965) has pointed out: "the more widely accepted thesis, based upon research evidence, is that low status obscures ability and prevents the full development of much potential. Gallagher (1975) exemplified support of this thesis when he stated that

> The hard facts are that unfavorable environment and circumstances do not provide for the linguistic development necessary for success in a complex culture whose very nature is built around verbal and linguistic systems (p. 374).

Kellaghan (1977), however, pointed out what may be an important fallacy in this conclusion. He suggested that:

> ". . . most studies . . . used social status variables (such as parental occupation or education) as measures of the home. However, we cannot expect such measures to throw much light on the processes that may be involved in interactions between behavioral and environmental facts."

Further, Gordon and Wilkerson (1966) also felt that too much emphasis on social status variables cause us to overlook that while adverse conditions of life do not facilitate academic achievement, there is no evidence that such conditions preclude academic success. Finally, an anecdotal observation reported by Poindexter (1973) in his autobiography suggests that social status variables do not provide the complete picture. He stated that:

> "Hereditary and cultural environmental factors of this family would prompt many a predictionist to forecast a dim future in academic performances and accomplishments for this family of children. According to the laws of averages they were right, but unexplained tenacity and motivations may and often do defy these types of predictions (p. 3)."

Kellaghan (1977) reported that a number of investigators have argued that there should be more attempts to describe the forces and factors in the home which surround and impinge on the child. A comprehensive national study (Plowden, 1967) exemplifies such an effort when it was concluded that "economic level and social class are much less important than aspects of parental attitude, attitude to education, and attitude to books and reading as determinants of the achievement and educational progress of primary school children" (p. 382). The Plowden Report also noted that "literate homes with good parental attitude toward school may be found in the slums as well as in the suburbs" (p. 382).

Kellaghan (1977) concluded from his study of the home environment "that when a measure of home processes rather than of social class is used, considerable variation is found to exist in the homes of a group of pupils that can be grossly defined as disadvantaged."

Kellaghan used six environmental process variables to assess the homes of his disadvantaged subjects: achievement press - parental aspirations for the education of the child; language model - quality of language usage of parents (e.g., pronunciation, vocabulary); academic guidance - extent of general supervision and suggestions regarding school work; family activeness - variety, frequency, and educational value of the acitivities of the family; intellectuality of the home - variety and thought-provoking elements in toys and games available to the child; and work habits of the family - degree of structure and routine in home management.

Kellaghan's approach finds much support in studies that have attempted to describe the home environment of minority achievers. Analysis of these findings suggest ways in which the number of minority children recommended for participation in gifted programs can be increased. These studies also suggest information that should be presented in inservice and preservice training programs to teachers and other educational officials who must nominate minority children for gifted programs. It is through this process that we can change the attitude of educators regarding minority children and gifted programs.

Coleman (1969a. 1969b), in his studies of disadvantaged children who are successful in school, reported that "school success and dropout are not class phenomena but rather are contingent upon certain parental school-reinforcement behaviors" (1969a, p. 95). He described the home environment as follows:

> There exists in this home a feeling of mutual respect between the parent and the child . . . a positive atmosphere prevails . . . characterized by helpfulness, stimulation, reward and freedom together with parental concern and guidance for the child. Parental assistance is always available but is given only when required. Stimulation is present in the form of overt encouragement on the part of the parents for the child to do well in School, to read, to have hobbies and to make friends. Stimulation is also provided by way of conversations between the parents and the child. Parents of successful children reward their children for accomplishments and usually the reward is praise. The child is allowed a good deal of freedom in managing his own affairs, in his conversation with his parents and with regard to the points of view he chooses to defend and to maintain. The parents exhibit concern for their child by being interested and involved in his immediate life, by requiring that he meet certain obligations to them, such as keeping them informed of his whereabouts and of his out-of-school activities, and by insisting on a certain standard of behavior. Punishments . . . are not of a physical nature and do not change the prevailing positive atmosphere of the home or the feeling of mutual respect which has been generated between the child and his parents (1969b, pp. 302-303).

Shade (1978) suggested that "the real difference between achievers and non-achievers is not the occupation and income of the family, but the difference in the family perceptions of the world" (p. 82). Slaughter

(1959) found that families of achieving Black children maintained a quality of communication that tends to stimulate the child's problem solving ability, independence and productivity.

Providing conditions that facilitate the development of intellectual ability is more difficult for many minority parents because of their low socioeconomic status but it is not impossible. The search for gifted children among minority groups must transcend the barriers implied by what appears to be a poor and therefore, unsupportive, unstimulating and anti-intellectual environment.

Maker (1983) has perhaps best described the problems associated with tests and minority gifted students when she stated that

> "It is difficult . . . to justify including in the program a student whose scores on the tests being used for identification are lower than the scores of children who do not "make it" into the program. It also seems difficult for many individuals to justify the use of different tests to identify children from different groups, even though these tests have been shown to be more appropriate (p. 317)."

How, then, do we find gifted children among minority group populations when state and school districts use cut-off scores for gifted programs somewhere in the 130 range and when it has been well documented that minority group children, especially Blacks, score on the average 15 points below most groups. Attempts to answer this question have been offered by a few researchers. For example, Bruch (1971) has suggested the use of the Abbreviated Binet for Disadvantaged (ABDA). This involves a special scoring procedure of items on the Binet that she has determined represent strengths of the disadvantaged.

The System of Multiculture Assessment (SOMPA) by Mercer and Lewis (1978) has been suggested as a way to assess disadvantaged students by comparing their behavior to those in the social system to which they belong. Then there is the Baldwin Matrix (BIM) in which information from a variety of sources is weighted to arrive as an overall evaluation.

This has not been nor was it intended to be an exhaustive review of assessment procedures suggested to locate the gifted in minority groups. Rather, the attempt was to sample some of the measures that various researchers have developed. The remainder of this section shall be a discussion of promising procedures and instruments not heretofore considered.

Using traditional measures. From 1934 to 1950 Jenkins conducted a study to locate superior Negro children. His studies were, in a sense a replication of the Terman study. The methods that he used demonstrated that traditional measures can be used to locate superior Negroes. A brief review of his method follows:

> A systematic search for superior Negro children in grades 3 to 8 of seven public schools in Chicago was conducted by Witty and Jenkins. The method of selection was similar to that used by Terman. That is, classroom teachers nominated the following children: (1) the child thought most intelligent, (2) the child doing the best class work, and (3) children one or more half-years under age for their grades. The McCall Multi-Mental Scale was administered to all of the nominees, and the Stanford-Binet was given to every child with an IQ of 120 or more on the McCall Scale. The New Stanford Achievement Test, Form W, was given to the 26 gifted children. The mean Binet IQ was 148.9. The

> average pupil demonstrated subject matter mastery 1.4 grades above the norm for children of his/her chronological age. The highest subject quotients were in language usage (146.6) and in reading (143.8). The lowest was in arithmetic computation (126.5). Among the conclusions reached by this study were the following: (1) Gifted Negro children may be found with about equal frequency at every grade and age level in the elementary school; (2) the educational achievement of gifted Negro children was not consonant with expectations based upon mental tests; and (3) the children demonstrated greatest educational superiority in those highly "verbal" subjects which appear not to depend greatly on school experience (1934, pp. 586, 594-595).

Fitz-Gibbon (1975) reported on a procedure to identify the top 2 percent in ability among eighth graders in an inner city school. A combination of the California Test of Mental Maturity, The Ravens Standard Progressive Matrices, the California Achievement Test, and teacher nominations were used for screening. Selection was based on results form the Ravens Advanced Progressive Matrice and the WISC-R.

These two examples illustrate that through the appropriate use of multiple criteria, gifted minority children can be located using traditional measures.

Measurement of learning potential. "Potential" means possible as opposed to actual; capable of coming into being or action. As I use learning potential to refer to minority students, I mean those students who have the capability of performing at above-average levels if they are appropriately identified. The earlier this identification occurs the better.

There is ample research to document that

> ". . . left to the educational opportunities available at existing schools in lower class areas, data shows that the longer the children are in these schools, the further behind they become in achievement. Substandard performance is expected. Even if disadvantaged students begin school with relatively few problems, and their reading achievement is at grade level in the early grades, these students fall increasingly behind national reading norms. Although arithmetic achievement stays close to national norms, these scores also fall as the student moves through the school system. Intelligence tests scores go down in proportion to time spent in school" (Clark, 1983, p. 333).

It has been pointed out that preoccupation with the "adverse" social and economic conditions of minority children impedes the identification of minority children with above-average potential. Also it is interesting to note that Henderson & Lang (1971), Sullivan (1973), Rubovits & Maehr (1973) and Shade (1978) have all observed that Black achievers tend to induce negative reactions from their teachers. Black gifted achievers receive less attention, are least praised, and most critized in a classroom, even when compared to their nongifted Black counterparts. These reports may help to explain why

potentially gifted minority students are not nominated for participation in gifted programs.

There are methods that can be used to determine the potential for above-average performance among minority group students. One method involves the use of standardized test data. It is a two-step process. First, examine the questions students answered correctly because they should have been exposed to the material through the curriculum. Second, evaluate the questions students answer correctly that cannot be attributed to exposure through the school's curriculum. This examination will provide an assessment of the student's ability to exceed fact acquisition. It will also give information regarding the student's ability to reason.

The California Environmentally Based Screen (Stallings, 1972) has developed an environmentally based screen that uses information from the child's immediate environment to test his/her abilities to reason, to remember, and to create. It involves the use of stimuli from the student's familiar environment. In the paraphrased words of Plato, "those who are not deceived have a vein of gold." It is that vein that can be tapped using environmental stimuli.

By using certain sections of the K-ABC, a promising new assessment tool, we can begin to assess fluid intelligence. Particularly promising are the mental processing composite, the simultaneous processing scale and the sequential processing scale.

Instruments like the Test of Logical Thinking (TOLT) are also useful to determine capacity to perform. The following logical thinking skills are measured by the TOLT: combinatorial, propositional, proportional, controlling variables and correlational.

Achieving minority boys and girls demonstrated a greater capacity for individual intiative, for setting reasonable goals, and for following through to completion. They were more adequate in most areas of personality functioning and scored higher on a rating of overall mental health.

A most surprising finding related to their fear of failure. Whereas underachievers were immobilized by failure, achievers were often stimulated to greater effort and subsequent success. This is contrary to the reported reaction to fear of failure among nonminority students.

Though the studies dealing with achievers among minority groups are limited, these exemplary studies at least suggest a more culture-specific approach. The development of rating scale items based on literary and research findings such as these should allow us to make more accurate observations.

A NONBIASED ASSESSMENT PROFILE[1]

Thus far, this discussion has pointed to approaches that won't work, described relevant traits of minority children that could enhance our ability to identify those with gifted potential, delineated characteristics of environments that support intellectual aspirations and given examples of assessment instruments and procedures that could be used with minority children. A large task, however, remains--how do you integrate this diverse information into the traditional process (i.e., intelligence test score, achievement test scores and teacher recommendation) used to certify children for participation in programs for the gifted? It is my contention that the integration of this new data is not the answer. Rather, the answer is to develop a profile that can truly demonstrate our use of multiple criteria in making placement decisions.

Frasier (1983) has presented a nonbiased assessment profile that allows for the interpretation of data from multiple sources. Data from learning potential measures, cognitive measures, creative measures, psychosocial measures, and measures of motivation are displayed on a profile chart. The data collecting instruments are quantitative and nonquantitative. A scale at the top allows for appropriate interpretations according to the evaluation method used.

The profile provides a collective picture of all relevant data on a student. Instead of making a linear decision as has been done in the past, a decision can now be considered on the basis of multiple data. The profile is so designed that screening as well as identification decisions are made on the basis of multiple criteria.

The profile has the added advantage of providing ways to make more accurate conclusions regarding instructional and counseling needs. By superimposing the initial identification profile over another profile developed at formative and summative points, student progress and program success can also be measured.

[1]For further information contact: Dr. Mary M. Frasier, Department of Educational Psychology, 325 Aderhold Hall, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia, 30602, (404) 542-4110.

References

Baldwin, A. The Baldwin Identification Matrix, its development and use in programs for the gifted child. Paper presented at the Council for Exceptional Children, Philadelphia, PA. 1980.

Banks, J. A. and J. D. Grambs (Eds.). Black self-concept: Implications for education and social science. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1972.

Bruch, C. G. For identification of the disadvantaged gifted. The Gifted Child Quarterly, 15(4), 267-272. 1971.

Clark, B. Growing up gifted. 2nd ed. Columbus: Charles E. Merrell, 1983.

Coleman, A. B. The disadvantaged child who is successful in school. The Educational Forum. November 1969a.

Coleman, A. B. Parents help their children succeed. The High School Journal, March 1969b.

Frierson, E. C. Upper and lower status gifted children: A study of differences. Exceptional Children, (32)(2), 83-90. 1965.

Gallagher, J. J. Teaching the gifted child. 2nd ed. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1975.

Glaser, E. M. and H. L. Ross. A study of successful persons from seriously disadvantaged backgrounds: Final report. Washington, D.C.: Department of Labor, Office of Special Manpower Programs (Contract No. 82-05-68-03), 1970.

Henderson, E. H. and B. H. Lang. Personal-social correlations of academic success among disadvantaged school beginners. Journal of School Psychology, 9, 101-113. 1971.

Hood, E. F. Motivating urban minority group youth. Education, 93(4), 362-366. 1973.

Kellaghan, T. Relationships between home environment and scholastic behavior in a disadvantaged population. Journal of Educational Psychology, 69(6), 754-760. 1977.

Maker, C. J. Editorial. Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 6(3), 137-139. 1983.

Mercer, J. and J. Lewis. Using the system of Multicultural Pluralistic Assessment (SOMPA) to identify the gifted minority child. In A. Baldwin, G. Gear, and L. Lucito (Eds.), Educational Planning for the gifted. Reston, VA: Council for Exceptional Children, 1978.

Plowden, B. Children and their primary schools: A report of the control advisory council for education. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1967.

Poindexter, H. A. My world of reality: An autobiography. Detroit, MI: Balamp Publishing, 1973.

Richert, E. S., J. J. Alvino, and R. C. McDonnel. National report on identification: Assessment and recommendations for comprehensive identification of gifted and talented youth. Sewell, NJ: Educational Improvement Center-South, 1982.

Riessman, F. The culturally deprived child. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.

Rubovitz, P. and M. Maehr. Pygmalion black and white. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 25, 210-218. 1973.

Shade, B. J. Social-psychological characteristics of achieving black children. The Negro Educational Review, 29(2), 80-86. 1978.

Slaughter, D. T. Maternal antecedents of the academic achievement behaviors of Afro-American head start children. Educational Horizons, 24-28. 1969.

Stallings, C. Gifted disadvantaged children. National Leadership Institute, Teacher Education/Early Childhood, Technical Paper. Storrs, CT: University of Connecticut, 1972.

Sullivan, A. R. The identification of gifted and academically talented black students: A hidden exceptionality. The Journal of Special Education, 7(4), 373-379. 1973.

APPENDIX D

Commissioned Paper:

The Challenge: To Nurture The

Full Development of Potential

In All Gifted Students

by

Dr. Joanne Rand Whitmore
Assistant Dean for Teacher Education
Kent State University

History will undoubtedly note that the 1980's were marked by critical reviews of American education and a barrage of demands for excellence. Schools are being challenged to provide greater excellence in teaching that will result in higher student achievement. Accompanying a general desire for excellence in our society and its schools has been a growing awareness of the need to do more to challenge and develop the full potential of students with a special talent or gift for learning and creative production.

Gifted education has become a focal point of study and discussion, if not an agenda priority, in many state departments of education and local school systems. I believe that this attention to the needs of intellectually gifted students and efforts to improve their educational programs can provide the stimulus and leadership necessary to accomplish significant improvements in curriculum and instruction for all children. However, the greatest potential gains from attention to gifted education will be lost if schools do not include in the population served those students who have not demonstrated their superior abilities consistently in high academic achievement but have evidenced exceptional potential. The schools I expect to be most successful in their response to demands for excellence and higher student achievement will be those whose educators (a) focus on developing the potential for learning in all students; (b) search continuously for special gifts in all children; and (c) nurture gifted performance in students with high potential as learners.

The purpose of this paper is to provide educational leaders in the state of Florida with basic information about gifted underachievers that will challenge them to seize the opportunity to provide leadership by demonstrating how to identify and develop exceptional academic potential in students with records of average or below average performance. The content of the paper will include sections on (a) definition of the terms; (b) identification of gifted underachievers (UAGs); (c) causes of underachievement that suggest methods of prevention and reversal; and (d) programming options for UAGs.

DEFINING THE TERMS

In this short paper, I will offer concise, simple yet accurate definitions that can facilitate the discovery of UAGs. First, to identify gifted underachievers one must have an accurate conception of giftedness in order to recognize it apart from patterns of high achievement. Since the wording of the 1972 Federal definition of "gifted" included potential as well as demonstrated ability, there has been growing awareness and acceptance of the fact that giftedness is a quality that exists prior to and apart from exceptional accomplishment, especially in children. However, schools generally design G/T programs first for the intellectually gifted or academically talented who are high achievers in the higher elementary grades. A precise definition of "intellectual giftedness" is the possession of exceptional potential as a learner on intellectual or cognitive tasks, which includes underachievers. A child's giftedness may be in one focused area of learning or cognitive processing, or in many areas and mental

processes. Few mentally gifted students have the capability of truly excelling in all subjects and on all kinds of academic tasks.

Underachievement can be simply defined as academic performance that is significantly lower than predicted based on some substantive evidence of learning potential. Test scores and skilled teacher observations most often provide the basis for judging the discrepancy. Although some professionals claim the discrepancy must be precisely measured and its degree of significance statistically tested, it is both practical and reasonable to assume there is a range of mild to severe underachievement and one need not quantify or statistically test the degree of significance to design and provide appropriate educational interventions. Such obstacles to identification generally occur to limit program accessibility to numbers manageable with funds available. All underachievers deserve attention to their needs and appropriate services/programming.

Operationally, a gifted underachiever is one who has evidenced exceptionally high potential for learning and academic achievement but is performing at a lower level, often "average" or below.

IDENTIFYING GIFTED UNDERACHIEVERS

Common practices in the identification of gifted students today involve the use of standardized achievement and aptitude tests, teacher recommendations, and grades. High achieving gifted students are easy to recognize by their academic performance. Underachievers are easy to miss, unless they perform well on standardized tests. Most UAGs do not reveal their exceptional ability on group-administered achievement or aptitude tests; the individually administered Binet or WISC usually provides the initial evidence of their giftedness. UAGs who possess exceptionally high aptitude in specific areas, such as math and science, which are not assessed on the Binet or WISC, often are detected through observation of their advanced problem solving skills and work on special projects. Even the content of standardized achievement tests does not allow students to demonstrate their exceptionally high abilities.

Discovery of the significant numbers of mentally gifted students who have not been recognized and served as "gifted" has occurred over the last two decades because of three changes in practices: (a) increased use of tests and more sophisticated assessment procedures; (b) increased teacher referral of students for special education services because of learning or behavioral problems; and (c) increased effort to develop the potential of culturally different and minority children. It has been in the process of assessing or working with those "disadvantaged" or "problem" children that exceptionally high mental abilities--sometimes quite specific, sometimes general--have been discovered during one-to-one interaction between the teacher/examiner and the pupil. Binet or WISC scores have revealed exceptionally high intelligence in some children referred for LD or BD placement, particularly.

As a result of these discoveries and the sharing of such information, the profession has become sensitized to the fact that it has tended to identify and serve only a segment of the gifted population, the high achievers. Some educators maintain that it is appropriate only to serve those students who excel far beyond the ability of the regular program to accommodate. However, the results of the Cupertino program (Whitmore, 1980) suggest that (a) gifted children who develop severe emotional and behavioral problems early in school and fail to succeed academically are among the most highly gifted and creative, and (b) the provision of appropriate educational programming reverses early patterns of school failure and results in patterns of high motivation and achievement. There is convincing evidence that all young mentally gifted students want to excel in learning, even in school, and that high achievement will result from providing appropriate programming. The potential gains to school systems and society from preventing and reducing underachievement are obvious.

In order to identify intellectual giftedness in students with average or lower performance, in the culturally different, and in the handicapped, all teachers in the system must be sensitively searching for evidence of exceptional potential for learning and achievement. Usually the individual psychological testing necessary for identification does not occur without teacher referral. And, it is possible that a skilled teacher may tap into a child's potential for exceptional achievement in science and math that may not even be evidenced in the results of a test battery. The reported high error of teachers in referrals for gifted programs has been a function of a lack of training and accurate information about giftedness--e.g., that all gifted students excel in many or all areas, are emotionally and socially more mature, are highly motivated to excel in school, and excel early in reading and language arts. These and other myths have created stereotypes that have caused many highly gifted students to be unrecognized. The myths represent overgeneralizations of Terman's research on high achievers by the public and profession.

What characteristics will reveal intellectual giftedness in students who are not high achievers? One must focus on those behaviors that are related to learning, to intellectual/academic performance. Intellectually gifted students can be discriminated from nongifted in terms of characteristics related to their level of cognitive development and the quality of their cognitive processing or thought. A list of discriminating "intelligent behaviors" usually includes: (a) communication--the use of symbolic systems as language; (b) memory for facts and events; (c) the use of acquired knowledge in problem solving and inquiry; (d) skills of reasoning--analytical thinking, synthesizing, inductive and deductive logic; (e) flexibility and fluency of thought--an ability to manipulate symbols and ideas, to transfer information across settings, to generalize from specifics, to perceive relationships; and (f) the creative production of new ideas, images, objects, etc. Gifted children, including underachievers and the handicapped, can be discriminated from nongifted students by the ease and speed with which they acquire those intelligent behaviors and by the quality, as well as quantity, of those behaviors. Except where handicaps or environmental factors inhibit development, gifted

children will be found to be accelerated in their development of those abilities and the quality, complexity, and sophistication of their behavior will be noticeably superior to their agemates.

If one is looking for intellectual giftedness, one must avoid attending to personality traits, social behavior, and emotional adjustment characteristics and focus on cognitive processing: learning and thinking. Traits such as high task commitment, initiative and independence, leadership ability, and self-disciplined behavior are not reliable indicators of giftedness because their development is a function of interaction between the child's personality and needs and the provisions of the environment. Most UAGs are not recognized as gifted by teachers because of their failure to behave "maturely," to appear highly motivated, and to respond positively to teacher direction or influence. Similarly, young gifted children slow in acquiring reading skills or motivation to read are not recognized because of the expectation that all mentally gifted children are quick to learn to read and to become eager readers.

Strategies for identification begin with classroom teachers becoming more skilled in teaching to stimulate and evoke the manifestation of higher abilities in all areas of cognitive processing--e.g., scientific reasoning, creative thinking and production, critical/evaluative thinking, etc. It is obvious that the identification of UAGs depends heavily upon curricula and instructional methods that not only allow but encourage children to reveal their exceptional abilities for thinking, learning, producing. The discovery of UAGs will be impeded by textbook-workbook instructional modes; classrooms without active inquiry and problem solving; and teachers who do not engage students regularly in the sharing of ideas, creative and critical thinking, discussions and debate. In those situations, identification will depend upon two other sources: parents and diagnostic assessments.

Parents can be valuable sources of information that lead to the discovery of giftedness in underachievers. Reports by parents of advanced projects and interests pursued at home are an important indicator. Carefully structured parent questionnaires or interviews to provide teachers with information about the child's out-of-school activities can reveal interests and abilities that provide clues to the child's giftedness. Certainly discrepancies between home and school performance on tasks involving intellectual ability must be seriously explored.

The second source of information beyond teachers that can lead to identification of UAGs has been mentioned earlier, special education assessment procedures. There is a critical need for school psychologists and special educators to become more informed about the nature of intellectual giftedness and about the characteristics of UAGs. Often identification has resulted from the sensitive perception of exceptional intellectual potential in a child during testing by a school psychologist. All school personnel need to be aware of the reliable characteristics of giftedness, the interfering stereotypes that blind us to recognition of giftedness in underachievers, and the

need to continually seek to "tap into" the hidden potential of UAGs by providing opportunities for them to develop and manifest their special abilities (Whitmore, 1982).

CAUSES OF UNDERACHIEVEMENT IN GIFTED STUDENTS

The cumulative records of UAGs and the referral forms for psychological assessment typically are found to describe the UAG student as:

> lazy, doesn't try; assigned work is persistently incomplete, and what is done is often messy and careless; unmotivated and uncooperative; frequently disruptive, aggressive or withdrawn; perpetually "off-task," shows no power of concentration during work periods.

If a child has exceptional potential for learning and has exhibited early in life high levels of curiosity and drives to know, understand, and master knowledge and skills, one wonders why the child is described by the words above. Careful analysis of the individuals in the Cupertino UAG project revealed that the reported patterns of behavior were the children's immature ways of coping with intense psychological conflict in the school experience. Their responses to the Cupertino intervention program demonstrated that none of them wanted to behave in ways leading to academic failure, teacher criticism, and peer ridicule or rejection.

What generated such conflict for these highly gifted children in classrooms? It was the tremendous gap between their levels of mental ability and actual performance, between their self-expectations and their accomplishments, between their personal interests and the content of the curriculum, and between their educational needs and instructional self-concepts and self-esteem, which led to individual patterns of withdrawal to avoid painful disappointment or aggressive behavior to compensate and frantically assert one's worth. More moderately underachieving gifted students tend to comply and conform, working and interacting minimally, thus never revealing the intellectual potential that would lead to higher expectations. In underachievers, the tendencies of gifted children to be perfectionistic, self-critical and demanding, and to be super-sensitive to others produce feelings of intense frustration, fear of failure and rejection, and guilt over unmet expectations.

From another perspective, one might categorize UAGs according to the principal cause of the child's failure to perform at a level closer to his/her ability. Four classifications seem to include all UAGs:

1. Motivational Problems--conflict between the child's personal values, interests, and needs and the school curriculum; or a preoccupation with other concerns, such as family problems or social isolation.

2. Lack of Environmental Nurturance of Intellectual Potential--low SES families that offer little exposure to books, advanced lan-

guage, stimulating development of thinking skills; or culturally different backgrounds that do not value academic achievement, especially for females.

3. Mild to Severe Handicaps, Developmental Delays, Poor Health--low energy or interfering hyperactivity; specific learning disabilities or delayed perceptual-motor skill development; specific brain damage/cerebral dysfunction or neurological impairment; hearing or vision impairment.

4. Specific or General Academic Skill Deficits--difficulty writing or reading; need to master basic facts and skills (math, spelling, letters and sounds); lack of prerequisite learning, e.g., skills of composition.

Regardless of the categorical cause of the individual student's psychological conflict that results in underachievement, the guidelines for programming are the same.

PROGRAMMING OPTIONS

In the past, UAGs have been regarded as emotionally disturbed or possessing psychological or personality problems. The common intervention has been individual counseling, provided usually during adolescence. A more successful approach is that of viewing the problem and need as fundamentally educational matters that can be effectively resolved in the classroom, within the "normal" experience of the child.

There is no one way to meet the needs of UAGs programmatically, but there is only one way to begin. After identification, an analysis must be made of the dynamic interaction between the child's characteristics and needs and the characteristics and demands of the school program. Then, one must design a program, manipulating all available resources, to meet the child's special needs and guide the development of new achievement-motivated behaviors. The program must address three critical needs of UAGs: (a) to grow in understanding themselves, the nature of their giftedness and their "problems"; (b) to learn constructive ways of coping with inevitable conflict and frustration; and (c) to develop a healthier, more realistic self-concept and higher self-esteem derived from realistic expectations and genuine success experiences, socially and academically.

There are five program components that determine success in reversing patterns of underachievement regardless of the program format.

1. The Teacher(s) must accept the fact that the child is mentally gifted, does not want to underachieve or fail, has low self-esteem, and needs to develop constructive coping skills and self-understanding. The teacher(s) must be skilled in guidance techniques, accurate in understanding the nature of giftedness, and positive in emotional response to the challenge of working with the child.

2. The Curriculum must be challenging, personally meaningful and rewarding to the UAG child a high percentage of the time. For the curriculum to be appropriate, it must be balanced between basic skill development and the arts and sciences, infused with career exploration and development of personal interests, and designed for maximum challenge and success.

3. The Instruction must require minimal memorization and drill/practice activity, and provide maximal opportunity for inquiry, scientific investigation, and creative production. Self-directed learning activity should be encouraged and student self-discipline nurtured. The climate created by the instructional style of the teacher should be one of excitement, anticipation, personal satisfaction, and low pressure.

4. The Peer Group of classmates must include at least a few other gifted students, possibly other underachievers, who may become special friends. The group must be accepting of individual differences, diversity.

5. Special Services should be provided as needed--for handicapping conditions or remedial instruction, for gifted education, or for group counseling. In addition, supplementary psychological and medical services often are needed from the community, as may be family counseling.

Some keys to success can be identified. Intervention will be more successful, in less time, the younger the student is. It is extremely advantageous to begin to identify and serve these children in the primary grades. With every year of school, the child's attitudes and behavior patterns become more deeply set. One must expect such change to require substantial time, even in the early grades. The more comprehensive the approach (e.g., self-contained classroom), the more quickly change will occur, and continuity from year to year for the student will ensure lasting effects. Another key to success is the use of an interdisciplinary team of professionals working with the parents for the benefit of the child. A wide range of expertise is often needed to help the child.

Models for delivery of services are few: (a) the self-contained classroom for UAGs, (b) the resource room delivery of special services with regular classroom placement, and (c) an IEP approach with all services provided within the regular program. The self-contained classroom at the primary level has been 100 percent successful; it was not as successful (about 50 percent) at the intermediate level in Cupertino. Because of the relatively few UAGs identified in systems, most services have been delivered through resource room support to regular classrooms. In such cases it is most important that the UAG student be allowed to receive special services for his/her giftedness as well as for a handicap. Often UAGs, especially LD/Gifted, are denied access to any special services because the child's performance is near grade level, the effect of giftedness moderating the handicap. The third model, the Individual Educational Plan, is one in which specialists assist the teacher(s) with modifications in the regular

program, sometimes with the child receiving additional instruction in other classrooms for specific subjects. At the secondary level, most programming is a homeroom or "core" period that provides for the monitoring of student progress, group counseling, and individual work on remedial skill development.

It is my personal and professional belief that the provision of a challenging, rewarding curriculum delivered with the motivating style of instruction appropriate for gifted students will significantly reduce underachieving behavior in gifted students and benefit all children in the classrooms. In one sense, the problem is quite simplistic, based on my experience. However, the major obstacle is the attitude of teachers toward gifted students who do not strive, conform, and acquiesce. . . so we find the most severe underachievers to be those who are most highly gifted and creative.

Reversing patterns of underachievement in gifted students requires mostly commitment, sensitive openness, flexibility, patience, good problem solving skills, and instructional skills for gifted education. Ignoring the problem, or denying the contribution of the school to its development, is counterproductive and results in severe emotional and behavioral problems in many gifted students who could be high academic achievers. In meeting the challenge to nurture the full development of potential in all gifted students, I am confident we can meet the demands for excellence in our schools.

References

Dowdall, C. B., & Colangelo, N. Underachieving gifted students: Review and implications, Gifted Child Quarterly, 1982, 26, 179-184.

Whitmore, J. R. Giftedness, conflict, and underachievement. Boston: Allyn & Bacon 1980.

Whitmore, J. R. Recognizing and developing hidden giftedness, The Elementary School Journal, 1982, 82 (3), 274-283.

APPENDIX E

Commissioned Paper:

An International Perspective

On Gifted and Talented Programs

by

Dr. Dorothy Sisk
Professor
University of South Florida

Different countries and societies vary in their attitude toward what constitutes excellence. As a result, the institutional arrangements made to develop excellence and to nurture talent are equally varied. This paper will discuss a number of programs for the gifted in selected countries, examining the definition of gifted, the identification procedures, the program offerings and where available, the evaluation procedures. Following a general discussion of programs, summarizing statements will be made concerning general practices for the gifted on an international level.

The Australian Schools Commission (1980) published a report entitled The Education of Gifted Students, in which they define gifted as students who possess to an outstanding degree of demonstrated competence or potential in intellectual, creative and/or other abilities and need different education or services beyond those provided by the regular school program. The commission explored several issues related to the identification of gifted students such as achievement versus potential, identifying gifted among minority and disadvantaged groups and underachievers. They recommended that the identification procedures be appropriate to the type of giftedness being served and that a range of procedures be used such as tests, teacher and parent judgments and performance and product evaluation. Ability grouping, acceleration, enrichment and curriculum modification were the organizational and instructional options that were itemized.

The Commission listed several necessary and key provisions for successful programs for gifted. These were: teachers, curriculum differentiation, student selection procedures, a statement of philosophy and objectives, staff orientation, an evaluation plan, and administrative arrangements.

A survey of existing programs in the Australian states includes: New South Wales has Opportunity classes, which are special classes made up of gifted children with IQ scores of 125 and above and good school records; Victoria, with a Gifted Children's Task Force which provides consultancy to teachers and schools; Queensland, which meets the needs and interests of the gifted through enrichment and uses community participation in the schools to offer a wider variety of educational experiences; South Australia, meeting the needs of the gifted in the regular classroom through enrichment; Western Australia, with special programs for creatively gifted secondary students and a variety of programs in primary schools ranging from part-time classes to special classes and advanced placement at the secondary level; Tasmania reported enrichment activities and short-term pullout programs; Australian Capital Territory, providing individual development and progression in the regular classroom and the Northern Territory providing for the gifted through enrichment in the regular class.

The Northern Territory of Australia issued a policy document through the Department of Education concerned with gifted children. They report special attention is given to modifications for Aboriginal children and children whose ethnic/social background or personality characteristics may require differentiated programming or identification procedures. The document recommends full-time classes or in-class enrichment as placement options, depending on the number of gifted children needing service. A Principal Education Officer is responsible for the coordination and implementation of

gifted programs in the Northern Territory. Creighton (1961) discusses education for the gifted in the U.S.S.R. and observes the following:

> Talent, in the Soviet view, is a human capability that finds its expression and development in a definite activity requiring that ability. Talent is specific, concrete and reveals itself in activity; it therefore requires opportunity and special institutions and facilities for its development. Soviet statesmen and educators have always stressed the importance of providing such facilities; a wide network of institutions has been developed and large sums spent on them.
>
> This search calls for a constant effort on the part of the teachers, educationists and persons working with young people, and leaders in every field. Schools, the Pioneer organizations, the Young Communist League, trade unions, the Society of Inventors, and the organizations of writers, architects, artists, and composers encourage it, while the Press is constantly impressing its importance on its readers (p. 247).

The Soviet system provides specialized secondary schools and special facilities and schools for the academically talented as well as for the talented in music, dance, theater, art and sports. All-Soviet contests of Olympiads are conducted in mathematics, physics, literature, biology, geography and philosophy. The participation in these Olympiads is between 10,000 - 20,000. In addition, there are a number of outside school programs for developing talents such as Pioneer Palaces, Pioneer Houses, Pioneer Camps and Cultural Clubs, all of which provide accelerated and advanced scholastic services, recreational facilities and guidance.

Bulgaria, under the direction and leadership of Madame Zhokova, has established a national program for creatively gifted which affords contests in music, dance and theater which culminates in a week-long festival, called the Banner of Peace and involves over 5,000 children from throughout the world. These contests and the festival are supported and attended by the organizations and unions of writers, architects, artists and composers who function as both mentors and teachers to the students. The children are identified through performance and product evaluation and teacher and parent recommendation.

Borzym (1983) in a fall meeting in Bulgaria reported on education for the gifted in Poland. She stated that an interdisciplinary commission whose charge was to study the problem of talented manpower with the objective of stimulating activities which would lead to the identification of talented people and the provision of programs for them, made the following recommendations:

1. Primary schools curricula should pose greater demands on gifted children and in individual cases allow an acceleration of the syllabus leading to their earlier school-leaving.

2. Create special-profile secondary schools or classes for children with special interests such as sports, art, languages, and mathematics.

3. Allow talented students in colleges and universities to follow individual broader and/or accelerated courses of studies ... and generally differentiate the demands made on students depending on their abilities.

The programs for the gifted in Poland as well as other U.S.S.R. countries are primarily for the intellectually gifted and they are identified through their performance and scores at various examinations and competitions, school work and information gathered from teachers' observations. Psychological measures are seldom used and only as a subsidiary assessment. Bulgaria has used the Ravens Matrices and the Stanford Binet has been translated by a psychologist named Pirov.

In summary, the provisions for the gifted in the U.S.S.R. include acceleration of courses leading to earlier school-leaving; special classes in secondary schools in mathematics, physics, humanities, biology, chemistry, all taught by teachers who have been identified as having higher professional standards and ranking; experimental mathematics classes which are taught by university professors; schools or classes in which a foreign language is the language of instruction for all subjects (such as Russian, English, French, German, Chinese); optional tutorials which offer intensive work in special interest subjects, similar to tutorials and seminars provided by university work; special interest clubs and associations, such as physics and technology clubs and mathematics clubs; subject olympiads which lead to annual national competitions in mathematics, biology, literature, foreign languages, and history; and a Patents Bureau in which inventions and designs of children can be assessed, accepted and patented to encourage creativity and invention.

Teachers are selected for these various options and provisions on the basis of their willingness to experiment, expressed interest in gifted, and high level of competence in their individual subject areas.

Eduardo Plaza (1979) at the Second World Conference on Gifted in San Francisco discussed programs for the gifted in Venezuela and reported on three major projects undertaken by an Institute for Educational Consulting. The first project is an experimental open classroom for curriculum enrichment; the second complementary education which provides out-of-school opportunities for students to work in music, fine arts, expressive arts and sciences; and counseling geared toward gifted students.

Recently Venezuela has established a Ministry of Intelligence under the leadership of Professor Machado which has as its goal the enhancement of the nation's intellectual resources, with emphasis on the gifted. The provisions are offered in the regular classroom with an emphasis on individualization and critical, creative thinking. Intensive inservice for all teachers has been provided under the leadership of DeBono from the United Kingdom.

Brazilian programs for the gifted are administered through the National Center of Special Education of the Ministry of Education and Culture. Their definition recognizes several types of giftedness, including intellectual, academic, creative, performing arts and leadership. The

national policy covers identification, the need for articulation of community resources and the provision of programs.

Identification methods include psychological testing, evaluation of school performance, parent and teacher interviews and observation. Special curriculum has been developed for the gifted from grades 4-8 and this curriculum has been evaluated and expanded annually.

Federal University under the direction of Professor Maria Mira provides an accelerated mathematics program for gifted ages 12-14, as well as offering teacher training in the area of the gifted. The Brazilian Association for the Gifted, founded in 1978 provides a number of services to parents, teachers and gifted children such as national conferences, educational camps for gifted with an emphasis on locating minority and disadvantaged gifted students. In the camp, there is emphasis on skill development and leadership, as well as creativity.

In July of 1983, Semiawan reported on an Indonesian Seven Year Plan for the Educational Services for the gifted and talented at the World Conference for the Gifted in Manila. She stated that priority is to be given to the development of the gifted in science and technology (1982-86), to be followed by program development in the humanities and social sciences (1985-89). A task force has been established and has recommended that the identification of gifted be based on intelligence test scores, school achievement, and teacher nomination as screening devices followed by selection based on scores of intelligence, creativity, and standardized achievement tests and a teacher and student questionnaire. Continuous progress and self-instructional modules are being used to afford gifted students opportunities for acceleration. Fellowships are given to gifted students who demonstrate high achievement both as an incentive and bonus. Teachers are being given special inservice training and the program is funded through the Ministry of Education and Culture.

Israel has a Department of Gifted Children which functions out of the Ministry of Education and provides financial and logistical support to help them provide programs for gifted and teacher training. Enrichment centers provide for approximately 30-40 percent of the potentially identifiable gifted population in Israel, ages 6-17. The Centers are funded on a shared-cost basis by parents' tuition, the Ministry of Education and the local sponsoring agent, whether it be a University, public school or private agency. The programs tend to focus on mathematics and science with computer-based and laboratory experiences. Special classes are provided for the highly gifted who are viewed as needing a more complete and intensive program. Specially prepared curriculum have been developed for these classes and a complete program of study is available from grades three to twelve. The curriculum provides acceleration, a greater range of learning opportunities and an increased breadth of study.

Correspondence courses through the Open University, mentor programs and private industry-sponsored courses meet the need for gifted students who require more specialization.

Teachers in gifted programs in Israel are selected from the general pool of teachers having evidenced competence in their fields and a sensitivity to

the special needs of gifted. Teachers are also provided with appropriate inservice training. Israel is also concerned with gifted disadvantaged children from low-income culturally different or minority populations. Smilansky (1978) and Schmueli (1983) at the World Conference of Gifted both report on the disadvantaged and minority gifted student. Smilansky (1978) reports on the techniques of locating and serving these students through centers. Sixteen schools in Tel Aviv and Jerusalem are served in two centers. The schools serve the students who are in the upper quarter of the elementary school according to teacher judgment and test criteria. Smilansky calls this a program for the gifted by assuming that these children are the more gifted in their group. In other words, it is not the regular assignment of giftedness as the upper 2 percent or the upper of any other percentage that somebody uses, but it is the assumption that they are potentially the more gifted in their own group. Although the average IQ of the upper quarter of the group is around 102 on the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children, an average group in terms of national norms in Israel, they are the upper group or the more gifted within their own group.

The children meet twice a week in the afternoon and during the entire summer for grades six, seven and eight, six days a week. They meet in a center, usually a high school, and the emphasis is on developing a group spirit and an attempt to build a different culture which emphasizes intellectual development and giving priority to learning as a counter culture to the dominant one in the disadvantaged area where other values predominate.

Another model used is the boarding program. This is particularly useful with the gifted adolescent student who needs additional assistance to develop their potential. The program began in 1960 and today includes 4,000 minority and disadvantaged students. The results show that a boarding school program costs twice as much as regular high school, but the results indicate double the level of those who graduate who are college bound and double the proportion of those who then graduate from the universities. "It costs twice as much, but produces twice as much." (Smilansky, 1978, p. 45)

The curriculum for the boarding school is based on modular units emphasizing sex roles, career education, relations with family, leadership and responsibility to the community and country. There is also a heavy emphasis on counseling.

Lin and Wu (1982) described experimental programs in Taiwan (Republic of China) as involving more than 3,000 students in 36 elementary and 19 junior high schools. The goals of the program are:

> ...to study the intellectual characteristics and creative abilities of the gifted; to develop appropriate curriculum and teaching methods for gifted students; to cultivate and develop an integrated and healthy personality of the gifted; and to determine a suitable educational system for the gifted. (p. 54)

Students are served in special classes or within the regular classroom if there are not sufficient students to form a class of gifted. The emphasis is on enrichment to broaden and amplify students' experiences and

knowledge. Field trips, social activities, research and advanced study as well as athletic and recreational activities are provided during the summer.

Special education centers have been set up at Normal University and Teachers College to train teachers and professors. The Ministry publishes a journal, Gifted Education Quarterly, and supplies materials, training, research, curriculum design and information to parents and teachers.

The United Kingdom as reported by Marjoram (1981), states that there is a growing awareness of the idea of giftedness and an increasing appreciation for the educational needs of the able.

One organization that has been very active in the United Kingdom is the National Association for Gifted (NAGC). They report (1982) that the identification procedures have become broader and more complex, with the instruments including those measuring creativity, aptitude, self-concept and attitudes. They also mention that there is a willingness to view identification and provision as inextricably interrelated. In a recent survey, NAGC found that in England, Scotland and Wales, 64 of 71 colleges that were surveyed supported the principle of enabling teachers to acquire training in the area of the gifted. They also surveyed the local educational authorities and found that 54 of 59 supported the principle of enabling teachers to acquire skills and understandings needed to work with the gifted. NAGC offers weekend courses, holiday courses, regional conferences, and counseling facilities. In addition, a trust agency, the Leonardo Trust is serving as an information bureau and provides workshops for teachers, gifted children and their parents. In this brief overview, several generalizations can be made concerning the identifying and nurturing of the gifted and talented. In general, in countries all over the world, whether the countries are developed or less developed there is a concern for locating and serving the gifted. This is evidenced by the over fifty-five countries which currently belong to the World Council for Gifted and Talented, whose secretariat is located at the University of South Florida, in Tampa. The philosophical base and motivations may vary, for example, in some cases such as the U.S.S.R., where there is motivation for developing brainpower and specialized talents; in comparison to other countries where the motivation is a concern for equal educational opportunity and self-development as well as meeting society's needs. Therefore, it can be said that under various political and economical systems, there are provisions for gifted and while the underlying philosophy may differ, the issues and program efforts for gifted are quite similar.

For example, most countries are supporting a need to develop broader and more liberal definitions of gifted education. However, most countries are currently serving intellectual giftedness and have added or are planning to add creativity. In the early stages, most nations seem to focus on intellectual or academic development and then move on to performing arts. Yet, in some countries, dance, music, and drama receive more attention, because they are viewed as less controversial and less elitist.

The basic identification procedures around the world include assessment of intellectual or academic aptitude, many using adaptations of instruments

from the United States and include some awareness of the multistep process such as initial screening, selection and evaluation. Yet, evaluation and research on identification instruments and procedures is a rarity in most countries.

Programs for the gifted include a variety of options, such as special classes, enrichment in the regular classroom and some form of acceleration. Again, most countries recognize the need for curricular and instructional differentiation varying the breadth, depth, tempo and nature of the educational programs to meet the needs of the gifted. Teacher education for working with the gifted consists mostly of inservice and is not widespread.

Out-of-school provisions are provided in a significant number of countries and oftentimes are the only provisions for gifted, such as the extracurricular centers in South Africa, and the activities of the National Association for Gifted in the United Kingdom. Mentor programs, the relating of adult specialists to gifted students, also appear to be a common practice for many countries.

In some countries, the guiding principle appears to be one of the schools encouraging an individual to develop his/her potential in areas of national needs; whereas, in other countries it is the individual's interests and needs that are developed.

Last, there is a concern for identifying and nurturing gifted students from disadvantaged or culturally different minority populations in a number of countries and this concern is growing. Several countries are focusing on ways of identifying these different and/or disadvantaged students, notably Israel, Venezula and Brazil. The program efforts for these students vary, but do have several common areas, namely, a wide and flexible identification procedure and individualized programs with an emphasis on career counseling and guidance. The program efforts are also highly different, ranging from summer programs, after-school programs to total boarding school efforts to locate and serve these under-served students.

One last observation can be made and that is that gifted education in many countries is not part of the total educational effort. It may well be that because the gifted and talented make up a relatively small proportion of the population, ranging from some countries serving 2 percent to others serving 25 percent. Gifted education may be viewed as intended for and carried out by a small number of advocates. Gifted education to thrive in any country must be viewed as a part of the total program and be involved in total school planning for the pursuit of individual talent identificaiton and development and the acquisition of excellence of all.

References

Australian School Commission. The Education of Gifted Students: A Discussion Paper. Canbera: Commonwealth Government Printer, 1980.

Borzym, Irena. "Educational and Social Care and Research on Gifted and Creative in Poland," paper presented in Bulgaria, October 1983.

Creighton, H. C.. "Facilities for the Talented in the U.S.S.R.," in Bereday, G.Z.F. and Lauwerys, J.A., editors, Concepts of Excellence in Education. op. cit., pp. 317-326.

Lin, Hsin-tai and Mu, Tzu-hui. "Gifted Education in Taiwan, Republic of China," Gifted International. 1:1, 51-59. 1982.

Marjoram, D.T.E., "Gifted Children--The British Scene." Unpublished English version. October 1981.

National Association for Gifted Children. Teaching Able and Gifted Children. London: The Association, 1982.

Northern Territory Department of Education. Education for Gifted in the Northern Territory. Darwin, N. T.: Northern Territory of Australia Department of Education, March 1983.

Plaza, Eduardo. "Program for Gifted and Talented Children in Venezuela," in Gallagher, J. J., editor, Gifted Children: Reaching Their Potential. New York: World Council for Gifted and Talented Children, 1979.

Schmueli, Eliezer. "Program for Gifted in Israel," paper presented at World Conference on Gifted and Talented, Manila, 1983.

Semiawan, Connie. "Programs for Gifted in Indonesia," paper presented at World Conference on Gifted and Talented, Manila, 1983.

Smilansky, Moshe. "The Culturally Disadvantaged Gifted Youth," GCT, November-December 1978.

APPENDIX F

Gifted and Talented Program

Study Questionnaire:

An Analysis

by

Dr. David Mealor
Director, School Psychology Program
University of South Florida

GIFTED AND TALENTED PROGRAM STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE: AN ANALYSIS

During the late Fall of 1983, the Bureau of Education for Exceptional Students sent a questionnaire to 230 randomly selected schools in the State of Florida. The questionnaire sought information pertaining to four specific areas related to programs for gifted students. The four areas were: identification, screening, gifted program and provisions for talented. Respondents were asked to either check appropriate categories or provide information specific to their own program. To facilitate ease in interpretation of the results, a brief descriptive narrative follows. The information is provided by each of the four major areas.

Identification

Of the 169 schools responding to the survey, 113 were elementary, 34 were junior and middle schools, and 22 were senior high schools.

Screening

Of the respondents, 65 were principals and 104 were counselors.

One hundred twenty-six schools use standardized achievement tests as the means for identifying candidates for further evaluation. Sixty-three schools use group administered tests; 90 schools use a gifted characteristics checklist; 91 use the Slosson Intelligence Test and 37 schools use grades for screening. Ten schools reported the use of teacher recommendations, Wide Range Achievement Test, the WISC-R, Stanford-Binet, and Advanced Placement as screening devices.

Counselors were reported most likely to screen students for the gifted program (123), followed by a regular education teacher (46), a school administrator (28), a school psychologist (27), a teacher of the gifted (17), a PRT (9), a curriculum specialist (6), a child study team (4), and a guidance committee (3).

A classroom teacher was reported most likely to refer a student for the gifted program (141), followed by a parent (44), a counselor (43), a school administrator (18), a teacher of the gifted (7), a PRT (6), the student (4), a curriculum specialist (3), and a school psychologist (1).

In 147 schools the percentage of minority students (blacks and hispanics) who are referred for the gifted program is less than the percentage of whites referred. In 9 of the schools responding, the percentage of minorities referred is about equal to the percentage of whites referred. In 4 of the schools the percentage of minorities referred was greater than the percentage of whites referred. Nine schools did not respond.

Gifted Program

Fifty-eight schools responded that most students in their district start in the gifted program in Kindergarten-Grade 2. In 85 schools responding, most students start in the gifted program in Grades 3-5. No school responded that

most students in their district started the gifted program in Grades 6-12. Twenty-one of the respondents did not know when most of their students entered the gifted program and did not answer.

The largest percentage of minority gifted students is perceived to be in the Grades 3-5 (63), followed by Grades 6-8 (14), Kindergarten-Grade 2 (7), and Grades 9-12(1). Sixty-four respondents did not know in which grade the largest percentage of minority students was located.

Most schools responded that gifted students were served in a resource center at a different location (56), followed by a resource room one day per week (52), a resource center at the school (31), a special class one period per day (26), a special class two periods per day (19), a resource room a half day per week (9), a special class most of the time every day (7), and other (10).

One hundred nine schools reported the availability of advanced placement courses for their gifted students. Eighty-five provide dual enrollment in a college or university; 68 participate in Duke University Talent Identification Program; 42 in the Brain Brawl Interscholastic Competition; 34 in Future Problem Solving Programs; 16 in Olympics of the Mind; and 9 in an International Baccalaurate Degree Program. Twenty-five schools provided none of these opportunities and 12 did not respond.

Talented

One hundred six schools reported that they do not have a special program for talented students. Of the 15 that do, 8 schools select students for the program based on teacher recommendations. Other criteria include scores on the CTBS 8-9, SAT's, the Renzulli-Hartman, the WRAT, honor roll, and auditions.

The amount of time students were reported spending in the talented program ranges from one hour per week to all day.

Schools responded that the content of their talented programs include enrichment/research activities, math games and computers, musical programs, media, guest speakers, advanced academics, performing arts, and advanced classes with enriched activities.

STATE OF FLORIDA
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
TALLAHASSEE 32301

RALPH D. TURLINGTON
COMMISSIONER

DOUGLAS W. CRAWFORD
DIRECTOR
DIVISION OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS

December 14, 1983

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Selected Principals

FROM: Wendy M. Cullar Wendy M. Cullar

SUBJECT: Survey for Gifted and Talented Program Study

Your school has been selected to participate in a survey which is part of the Gifted and Talented Program Study being conducted for the State Board of Education and the Legislature.

The questionnaire is to be completed by the person in your school who is most knowledgeable about the screening, referral and placement of students in gifted and/or talented programs. This person should be either you, an assistant principal, or the head of counseling services.

Please complete the form immediately and return it no later than January 6, 1984, to:

Gifted and Talented Study
Bureau of Education for Exceptional Students
Florida Department of Education
Knott Building
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

Thank you for your assistance.

WMC:eea

enclosure

107

Affirmative action/equal opportunity employer

Name of District _____

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
DIVISION OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS
BUREAU OF EDUCATION FOR EXCEPTIONAL STUDENTS

SURVEY FOR GIFTED AND TALENTED PROGRAM STUDY
1983-84

I. Identification. Check the response which best describes your district, school, and job.

A. Your school is best described as:

___ Elementary
___ Junior High or Middle School
___ Senior High
___ Other (Explain) _____

B. Your job is most like which of the following?

___ principal, administrator
___ counselor, student services

II. Screening. Screening is that process by which a rapid assessment is made to identify candidates for further evaluation.

1. Indicate instrument(s) and cut-off score(s) used to identify students for further evaluation for the gifted program. (Check all that apply.)

___ Standardized achievement test
Give name _____
Give cut-off score _____

___ Group-administered intelligence test
Give name _____
Give cut-off score _____

___ Gifted Characteristics Checklist
Give name _____
Give cut-off score _____

___ Slosson Intelligence Test
Give cut-off score _____

___ Grades
Give cut-off score _____

___ Other - Explain: _____

2. Who screens students for the gifted program by reviewing scores referred to in Question #1?

___ regular classroom teacher
___ counselor
___ teacher of the gifted
___ a school administrator
___ other - Explain: _____

3. Who is most likely to refer a student for the gifted program?

___ classroom teacher
___ counselor
___ teacher of the gifted
___ a school administrator
___ parent
___ other - Explain: _____

4. The percentage of minority students (blacks and hispanics) who are referred for the gifted program is:

___ less than the percentage of whites referred
___ about equal to the percentage of whites referred
___ more than the percentage of whites referred

III. Gifted Program

1. In this district most students start in the gifted program when they are in:

___ Kindergarten-Grade 2
___ Grades 3-5
___ Grades 6-8
___ Grades 9-12
___ Other - Explain: _____

2. In this district the largest percent of minority gifted students are in:

___ Kindergarten-Grade 2
___ Grades 3-5
___ Grades 6-8
___ Grades 9-12
___ Other - Explain: _____

3. Gifted students from this school are served in the following (check all that apply):

___ a resource center at this school
___ a resource center at another location
___ a resource room ½ day per week
___ a resource room 1 day per week
___ a special class 1 period per day
___ a special class 2 periods per day
___ a special class most of the time every day
___ other - Explain: _____

4. In this district the following opportunities are available for gifted students (check all that apply):

___ Dual enrollment in a college or university
___ Advanced placement courses
___ International Baccalaureate Degree Program
___ Future Problem Solving Program
___ Olympics of the Mind
___ Duke University Talent Identification Program
___ Brain Brawl Interscholastic Competition
___ None of the above

IV. Talented

1. Does your school have a special program for talented students?

___ No (If this response is checked, you have completed the survey.)
___ Yes (If this response is checked, please answer questions 2-4.)

2. How are students selected for the talented program?

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. Describe the amount of time students spend in the talented program.

_____

_____

4. Describe the content/activities of the talented program.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Please return by January 6, 1984, to:

Gifted and Talented Study
Bureau of Education for Exceptional Students
Florida Department of Education
Knott Building
Tallahassee, FL 32301

State of Florida
Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida
Ralph D. Turlington, Commissioner
Affirmative action/equal opportunity employer

APPENDIX G
SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES
RELATED TO GIFTED AND TALENTED STUDY

August, 1983	The Gifted and Talented Study Plan approved (See next pages)
September, 1983	Meeting of Oversight Committee Data Analysis and Organizational Meeting of Study Panel (See some tables of the data examined and the listing of decisions to be made by the panel)
October, 1983	Meeting of Oversight Committee Presentations at Florida CEC, Florida Association of Gifted, and Florida Association of Science Teachers Meeting with University Representatives
November, 1983	Meeting with Representatives of Governor's Summer Programs Mailed Commissioner's Invitation to Submit Testimony in Gifted and Talented Programs
December, 1983	Panel of Experts heard testimony at hearings in Miami, Orlando, and Tallahassee Joint meeting of Panel and Oversight Committee
January, 1984	Meeting of Panel to organize material for report
February, 1984	Report Written Division Analysis and Recommendations written
March, 1984	State Steering Committee considered Report and Division Analysis and Recommendations

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
DIVISION OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS
BUREAU OF EDUCATION FOR EXCEPTIONAL STUDENTS

The Gifted and Talented Program Study Plan
September, 1983

I Authorization

396A Special Categories
Gifted and Talented Program Study from General Revenue Fund $25,000

The legislature recognizes that minority students have not been adequately identified and given opportunities to benefit from Gifted Programs. Therefore, the Commissioner of Education shall conduct a study with the funds provided in specific appropriation 396A of the membership in gifted programs and talented programs, criteria for eligibility for gifted programs and talented programs, and the extent to which public school programs for the gifted and the talented have been successful in increasing student achievement and broadening educational opportunities for these students. The study shall also recommend a cost factor and specific criteria for special programs for talented students for adoption by the State Board of Education. The results of the study shall be submitted by March 1, 1984, to the State Board and the Chairmen of the House of Representatives and Senate Education Committees with recommendations for changes in State Law, State Board of Education Rules, or School District Procedures.

II Issues to be Addressed

The following issues are to be addressed in the Gifted and Talented Study:

A. How can minority representation in gifted and talented programs be increased?
   1. What factors currently influence the membership in gifted and talented programs?
   2. What factors could increase minority membership in gifted and talented programs?
   3. What additional or different procedures or criteria should be considered for eligibility of students for gifted and talented programs?

B. What are the effects of the current school programs for the gifted and talented?
   1. How have the current gifted and talented programs been successful in increasing student achievement and broadening educational opportunities?
   2. What additional or different programs should be available for gifted and talented students?
   3. What resources are needed to support the program?

III Approach to the Study

The Study will contain information obtained from the following sources:

- papers commissioned from experts on topics related to the Issues to be addressed
- existing data available on current programs for the gifted and talented
- guidance from the Oversight Committee
- recommendations from the Panel of Experts
- testimony of individuals at public hearings
- letters from concerned citizens, teachers, and administrators

To implement the study of gifted and talented programs as provided for by the 1983 Appropriation Act, it is recommended that a panel of experts be assembled to review existing information, conduct public hearings, analyze the information and produce written recommendations. A written report for the Legislature and the State Board of Education would be produced from this information.

Ms. Deborah Bellflower would be the major staff person responsible for the organization and implementation of this study. Four consultants would be identified for the panel of experts. Individual consultants' services contracts would be made with each consultant for both their on-site time in the state as well as time for preparation and writing recommendations for the report. Staff assistance to research and compile data would be provided by an OPS graduate student.

The rationale for utlizing consultants would be to utilize recognized national experts who have credibility within the state and are free from a vested interest in program implementation. Recommended consultants would represent expertise in the general areas of teacher training, gifted and talented education, student assessment and evaluation, program assessment and evaluation with specific expertise in the education of minority and atypical gifted and talented students and state policy for gifted education.

It is proposed that the consultants would have an organizational meeting in Key West for two days. This meeting would coincide with the fall Administrators' Management Conference. On day one the panel would organize to carry out the task and receive information from DOE personnel, the second day the panel will review data on existing programs and design the methodology for the study. The panel would convene on two additional occasions, once to hear testimony from individuals and organizations such as FLAG, CEC, throughout Florida--3 sites probably in Miami, Orlando, and Tallahassee; second to review all data collected, and provide written recommendations for the study.

A. Oversight Committee

The purpose of the Oversight Committee is to advise the Bureau of Education for Exceptional Students regarding the focus of the study and to oversee the planned activities. Committee members will meet on three occasions.

Oversight Committee Members

Elinor A. Elfner	Bureau of Education for Exceptional Students	CL-A 488-2137
Jim Crosier	Bureau of Curriculum Services	4 EX 488-6769
Neila Connors	Bureau of Curriculum Services	412 WC-A 487-1020
Cecil Carlton	Bureau of Compensatory Education	34A COL 488-6688
Susanne Taranto	District Management Services	228 K 488-8385
Martha Chang	Commissioner's Office	1702 C 487-1630
Marshall Frinks	Commissioner's Office	1701 C 487-2910
Myrtle Bailey	Governor's Office	411 CLTN 487-1880
Ike Tribble	State University System	209 COL 488-7702
David Ehlert	Division of Community Colleges	310 COL 488-0555
H.B. Pinkney	Bureau of Program Support Services	561 K 488-5270
Don Darling	Bureau of Program Support Services	563 K 488-8974
Deborah Bellflower	Bureau of Education for Exceptional Students	CL-A 488-1106
Jeanine Blomberg	Bureau of Management Systems and Services	369 K 488-5142
Lynn Lavely	House of Representatives-Speakers Office	
Mike O'Farrel	Senate Education Committee	36 SOB 488-7609
Carla Lunetta	House Education Committee	

B. Panel of Experts

The following persons have been identified as the panel of experts for the study:

Dr. Mary Frasier, Associate Professor, Gifted Education, University of Georgia

Dr. David Mealor, Director, Assessment and Evaluation, School Psychology Program, University of Central Florida

Ms. Gail Smith, State Director, Gifted Programs, North Carolina Department of Education

Dr. William Durden, Director, Center for the Advancement of Academically Talented Youth, The Johns Hopkins University

The role of the panel of experts is to review information and make recommendations to the Commissioner of Education regarding programs for gifted and talented students. Dr. James Gallagher will also review the progress of the study. To carry out this mission the panel is charged with the following responsibilities:

1. to review and analyze the existing data and scholarly literature on each issue identified above,
2. to study current program data with particular reference to the impact upon the enhancement of achievement and educational opportunities for gifted and talented students,
3. to examine current programs for gifted and talented students in Florida and compare and contrast with a representative sample of the other states,
4. to hold hearings and to receive testimony and expert advice on the issues to be addressed,
5. to synthesize all data and make practical recommendations for action to be taken.

IV Timelines

September - 1983

Identify Oversight Committee and Panel of Experts.
Contact all Committee and Panel Members.
Initial meeting of Oversight Committee.
Initial meetings of Panel of Experts.
Review current data and scholarly literature.
- review district procedures for data
- conduct review of literature pertaining to the issues to be addressed

Initiate request for topical papers from experts.

October - 1983

Distribution of data collection survey.
Continue collection and organization of study data.
Review status of study - CEC/FLAG Conference, Governor's Summer Program Components meeting.

November - 1983

Complete review of literature, data survey.
Review of additional data, topical papers and additional resources.
Review of the study - State Steering Committee for Gifted Programs.

December - 1983

Present data and review of literature to the Panel of Experts for assimilation, review and recommendations.
Conduct hearings around the state.
Begin writing of Study Report.

January and February - 1984

Complete draft of the report.
Report is reviewed and criticqued by the Panel of Experts and the Oversight Committee.
Rewrite Report.
Prepare for printing and submit.
Submit Report to Division of Public Schools.
Submit Report to Commissioner of Education for submission to the State Board of Education and the Legislature.

FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
DIVISION OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS
BUREAU OF EDUCATION FOR EXCEPTIONAL STUDENTS

PANEL OF EXPERTS - DECISIONS
September 29 and 30, 1983

Data

What additional data need to be collected?

How should the data be collected (meetings, surveys, etc.) and by whom?

What topics should be selected for Commissioned Papers and who should author them?

Future Meetings

What should be the timelines for the Hearings in December (start at 3 p.m. with a break and resume in the evening)?

Contacts for the Hearings

Format for conducting the Hearings -

- role of panel members
- soliciting testimony and follow-up in writing
- timelines (experts come in on night of 5th and work morning of 6th or stay over 8th)

Possible meeting at NAGC

Report

Format of report

Schedule of writing, review, editing, etc.

Responsibilities (sections, topics, etc.)

MEMBERSHIP IN GIFTED PROGRAMS FOR EXCEPTIONAL STUDENTS
BY RACIAL/ETHNIC CATEGORIES
1982-83 SCHOOL YEAR

		White Non-Hispanic	Black Non-Hispanic	Hispanic	Asian/Pacific Islander	Amer. Indian/ Alaska Nat.	TOTAL
Panhandle	Bay	208	3	-	4	-	215
	Calhoun	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Escambia	318	11	1	10	1	341
	Franklin	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Gadsden	32	25	-	-	-	57
	Gulf	12	-	-	-	1	13
	Holmes	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Jackson	83	1	1	-	-	85
	Jefferson	3	7	-	-	-	38
	Leon	576	48	3	10	-	637
	Liberty	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Madison	33	8	-	-	-	41
	Okaloosa	1028	21	9	20	1	1079
	Santa Rosa	340	3	-	4	-	347
	Taylor	41	4	-	-	-	45
	Wakulla	42	-	-	-	-	42
	Walton	10	-	-	-	-	10
	Washington	8	-	-	-	-	8
TOTAL		2762	131	14	48	3	2958
Crown	Alachua	827	28	6	19	-	880
	Baker	17	-	-	-	-	17
	Bradford	35	-	-	-	-	35
	Citrus	275	4	-	4	-	283
	Clay	733	6	7	16	1	763
	Columbia	126	3	-	5	-	134
	Dixie	44	1	-	-	-	45
	Duval	2050	126	9	51	-	2236
	Flagler	40	-	-	-	-	40
	Gilchrist	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Hamilton	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Lafayette	8	-	-	-	-	8
	Levy	134	5	-	-	-	139
	Marion	496	48	5	9	-	558
	Nassau	61	-	-	-	-	61
	Putnam	104	3	-	-	-	107
	St. Johns	203	-	-	2	-	205
	Suwannee	23	1	-	-	-	24
	Union	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL		5176	275	27	106	1	5535
East Central	Brevard	1408	19	9	21	2	1459
	Indian River	170	3	1	1	-	175
	Lake	277	7	1	1	-	286
	Okeechobee	65	-	-	3	-	68
	Orange	2681	89	28	47	1	2846
	Osceola	143	1	1	3	-	148
	St. Lucie	132	10	-	1	-	143
	Seminole	870	11	11	22	-	914
	Sumter	22	1	-	-	-	23
	Volusia	800	37	4	10	-	851
TOTAL		6568	178	55	109	3	6913
West Central	Charlotte	96	-	2	1	-	99
	DeSoto	78	-	-	3	-	81
	Glades	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Hardee	54	3	1	-	-	58
	Hernando	145	2	-	-	-	147
	Highlands	171	3	3	4	-	181
	Hillsborough	2064	97	23	34	-	2218
	Lee	1216	26	13	7	-	1262
	Manatee	287	4	2	-	-	293
	Pasco	470	4	4	7	-	485
	Pinellas	3095	133	6	28	-	3262
	Polk	487	25	9	5	-	526
	Sarasota	573	4	7	16	1	601
TOTAL		8736	301	70	105	1	9213
South	Brevard	4229	204	76	65	-	4574
	Collier	425	9	19	1	2	456
	Dade	2045	196	267	61	-	2569
	Henry	27	-	3	-	1	31
	Martin	175	3	2	3	-	183
	Monroe	86	2	1	-	-	89
	Palm Beach	1640	108	38	32	4	1822
TOTAL		8627	522	406	162	7	9724
STATE TOTAL		31869	1357	572	530	15	34343

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERCENT OF RACIAL/ETHNIC MEMBERSHIP

1982-83 School Year

* Gifted Program Percentages/Minority (mandate includes K-12)
Public School Percentages/Minority (Pre K-12)

	WHITE*		BLACK*		HISPANIC*		ASIAN-PACIFIC*		AMERICAN INDIAN*	
	In School Population	In Gifted Program	In School Population	In Gifted Program	In School Population	In Gifted Program	In School Population	In Gifted Program	In School Population	In Gifted Program
ALACHUA	64.29	93.98	32.55	3.18	1.78	.68	1.36	2.16	.03	--
BAKER	81.39	100	18.38	--	.14	--	.06	--	.03	--
BAY	80.85	96.74	15.84	1.4	1.11	--	1.58	1.86	.61	--
BRADFORD	77.13	100	22.17	--	.28	--	.41	--	--	--
BREVARD	83.36	96.5	14.54	1.30	1.02	.62	.89	1.44	.09	.14
BROWARD	69.47	92.46	25.27	4.46	4.21	1.66	.86	1.42	.18	--
CALHOUN	81.80	--	17.41	--	.05	--	.15	--	.60	--
CHARLOTTE	93.33	96.97	4.71	--	1.38	2.02	1.03	1.01	.09	--
CITRUS	92.93	97.17	5.54	1.41	1.12	--	.31	1.41	.09	--
CLAY	91.42	96.07	6.19	.79	.87	.92	1.32	2.10	.19	.13
COLLIER	73.55	93.2	7.38	1.97	16.09	4.17	.37	.22	.62	.44
COLUMBIA	72.59	94.03	26.63	2.24	.41	--	.34	3.73	.03	--
DADE	28.84	79.6	31.32	7.63	38.80	10.39	.99	2.37	.04	--
DE SOTO	71.33	96.3	25.22	--	2.96	--	.49	3.7	.00	--
DIXIE	87.03	97.78	12.37	2.22	.36	--	.24	--	--	--
DUVAL	61.60	91.68	36.12	5.64	.77	.40	1.42	2.28	.09	--
ESCAMBIA	69.39	93.26	27.78	3.23	.27	.29	2.33	2.93	.23	.29
FLAGLER	75.73	100	23.47	--	.70	--	.05	--	.05	--
FRANKLIN	81.15	--	18.31	--	.18	--	.36	--	--	--
GADSDEN	17.17	56.14	82.40	43.86	.15	--	.27	--	--	--
GILCHRIST	95.12	--	4.88	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
GLADES	65.36	--	27.88	--	5.10	--	.12	--	1.54	--
GULF	74.66	92.31	25.20	--	--	--	.09	--	.04	7.69
HAMILTON	52.04	--	47.82	--	.09	--	.04	--	--	--
HARDEE	68.56	93.10	10.60	5.17	20.53	1.72	.17	--	.15	--
HENDRY	61.70	87.1	21.94	--	14.07	9.68	.27	--	2.02	3.23
HERNANDO	88.67	98.64	9.39	1.36	1.52	--	.39	--	.03	--
HIGHLANDS	71.68	94.48	24.09	1.66	3.28	1.66	.50	2.21	.45	--
HILLSBOROUGH	73.98	93.06	20.22	4.37	4.86	1.04	.87	1.53	.07	--
HOLMES	97.39	--	2.21	--	.03	--	.37	--	--	--
INDIAN RIVER	75.79	97.14	22.65	1.71	1.28	.57	.28	.57	.01	--
JACKSON	68.40	97.65	31.08	1.18	.29	1.18	.18	--	.04	--
JEFFERSON	34.28	81.58	65.48	--	--	--	.24	--	--	--
LAFAYETTE	90.70	100	9.20	--	.10	--	--	--	--	--
LAKE	78.18	96.85	19.74	2.45	1.64	.35	.37	.35	.07	--
LEE	78.21	96.35	16.08	2.06	5.01	1.03	.60	.55	.10	--
LEON	63.72	90.42	34.91	7.54	.60	.47	.66	1.57	.11	--
LEVY	77.94	96.4	20.86	3.6	.95	--	.24	--	--	--
LIBERTY	86.35	--	13.17	--	.48	--	--	--	--	--
MADISON	42.90	80.49	56.94	19.51	.16	--	--	--	--	--
MANATEE	79.00	97.95	17.19	1.37	3.05	.68	.65	--	.11	--
MARION	73.55	88.89	24.36	8.6	1.66	.9	.31	1.61	.12	--
MARTIN	81.05	95.63	14.98	1.64	3.46	1.09	.41	1.64	.09	--
MONROE	74.18	96.63	10.34	2.25	13.25	1.12	1.98	--	.24	--
NASSAU	82.65	100	17.24	--	.05	--	.04	--	.01	--
OKALOOSA	85.04	95.27	11.29	1.95	1.02	.83	2.59	1.85	.06	.09
OKEECHOBEE	81.17	95.59	10.19	--	5.89	--	.32	4.41	2.43	--
ORANGE	70.27	94.2	25.77	3.13	4.39	.98	1.49	1.65	.08	.04
OSCEOLA	85.94	96.62	8.41	.68	4.59	.68	1.02	2.03	.04	--
PALM BEACH	62.57	90.01	29.24	5.93	7.31	2.09	.69	1.76	.20	.22
PASCO	92.67	96.91	4.12	.82	2.49	.82	.49	1.44	.24	--
PINELLAS	80.82	94.88	17.63	4.08	.40	.18	1.10	.86	.05	--
POLK	75.65	92.59	21.75	4.75	1.86	1.71	.63	.95	.12	--
PUTNAM	69.62	97.2	29.19	2.8	1.00	--	.16	--	.03	--
ST. JOHNS	77.85	99.02	21.08	--	.68	--	.37	.98	.02	--
ST. LUCIE	58.20	92.31	40.19	6.99	1.35	--	.21	.7	.05	--
SANTA ROSA	93.59	97.98	4.92	.86	.43	--	1.03	1.15	.03	--
SARASOTA	85.96	95.34	11.60	.67	1.46	1.16	.93	2.66	.05	.17
SEMINOLE	82.02	95.19	14.12	1.2	2.70	1.2	1.14	2.41	.01	--
SUMTER	72.27	95.65	26.30	4.35	1.19	--	.07	--	.18	--
SUWANNEE	76.67	95.83	22.82	4.17	.17	--	.30	--	.04	--
TAYLOR	74.45	91.11	25.34	8.89	.06	--	.12	--	.03	--
UNION	79.35	--	17.91	--	1.80	--	.79	--	.14	--
VOLUSIA	78.00	94.01	19.69	4.35	1.79	.47	.47	1.18	.05	--
WAKULLA	78.05	100	21.75	--	.16	--	.04	--	.00	--
WALTON	84.88	100	13.59	--	.54	--	.64	--	.35	--
WASHINGTON	74.12	100	25.25	--	.38	--	.23	--	.03	--
TOTAL	48.90	92.8	27.81	3.95	22.26	1.67	.88	1.54	.15	.04

ROSE—TALLAHASSEE—11979

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

'81 1981

TABLE 1

STUDENT MEMBERSHIP, PRE-K - 12
FALL 1982
NUMBER AND PERCENT* BY RACIAL/ETHNIC GROUP

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	White Non-Hispanic		Black Non-Hispanic		Hispanic		Asian/ Pacific Islander		American Indian/ Alaska Native		Total Minority		Total
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	All Races
[illegible]													
[illegible]	25,956	80.85%	3,126	15.84%	220	1.11%	312	1.58%	121	.61%	3,779	19.15%	19,735
Calhoun	1,649	81.80	351	17.41	1	.05	3	.15	12	.60	367	18.20	2,016
Escambia	28,243	69.39	11,308	27.78	111	.27	948	2.33	93	.23	12,460	30.61	40,703
Franklin	1,352	81.15	305	18.31	3	.18	6	.36	-	.00	314	18.85	1,666
Gadsden	1,646	17.17	6,938	82.40	13	.15	23	.27	-	.00	6,974	82.83	8,420
Gulf	1,671	74.46	564	25.20	-	.00	2	.09	1	.04	567	25.34	2,238
Holmes	3,177	97.39	72	2.21	1	.03	12	.37	-	.00	85	2.61	3,262
Jackson	5,200	68.40	2,363	31.08	22	.29	14	.18	3	.04	2,402	31.60	7,602
Jefferson	725	34.28	1,385	65.48	-	.00	5	.24	-	.00	1,390	65.72	2,115
Leon	14,131	63.72	7,741	34.91	134	.60	146	.66	24	.11	8,045	36.28	22,176
Liberty	898	86.35	137	13.17	5	.48	-	.00	-	.00	142	13.65	1,040
Madison	1,381	42.90	1,833	56.94	5	.16	-	.00	-	.00	1,838	57.10	3,219
Okaloosa	19,241	85.04	2,554	11.29	230	1.02	587	2.59	14	.06	3,385	14.96	22,626
Santa Rosa	11,221	93.59	590	4.92	52	.43	124	1.03	3	.03	769	6.41	11,990
Taylor	2,453	74.45	835	25.34	2	.06	4	.12	1	.03	842	25.55	3,295
Wakulla	1,909	78.05	532	21.75	4	.16	1	.04	-	.00	537	21.95	2,446
Walton	3,161	84.88	506	13.59	20	.54	24	.64	13	.35	563	15.12	3,724
Washington	2,540	74.12	872	25.25	13	.38	8	.23	1	.03	894	25.88	3,434
[illegible]	134,374	71.46	48,012	25.98	836	.52	2,219	1.37	266	.16	45,353	28.04	161,727
[illegible]													
Alachua	13,996	64.29	7,086	32.55	388	1.78	295	1.36	6	.03	7,775	35.71	21,771
Baker	2,807	81.39	634	18.38	5	.14	2	.06	1	.03	642	18.61	3,449
Bradford	2,982	77.13	857	22.17	11	.28	16	.41	-	.00	884	22.87	3,866
Citrus	8,031	92.93	479	5.54	97	1.12	27	.31	8	.09	611	7.07	8,642
Clay	15,496	91.42	1,050	6.19	148	.87	224	1.32	32	.19	1,454	8.58	16,953
Columbia	5,152	72.59	1,890	26.63	29	.41	24	.34	2	.03	1,945	27.41	7,097
Dixie	1,456	87.03	207	12.37	6	.36	4	.24	-	.00	217	12.97	1,673
Duval	61,087	61.80	35,813	36.12	761	.77	1,412	1.42	90	.09	38,076	38.40	99,163
Flagler	1,523	75.73	472	23.47	14	.70	1	.05	1	.05	488	24.27	2,011
Gilchrist	1,404	95.12	72	4.88	-	.00	-	.00	-	.00	72	4.88	1,476
Hamilton	1,172	52.04	1,077	47.82	2	.09	1	.04	-	.00	1,080	47.96	2,252
Lafayette	887	90.70	90	9.20	1	.10	-	.00	-	.00	91	9.30	978
Levy	3,194	77.94	855	20.86	39	.95	10	.24	-	.00	904	22.06	4,098
Marion	16,788	73.55	5,459	24.36	380	1.66	70	.31	28	.12	6,037	26.45	22,823
Nassau	6,051	82.65	1,262	17.24	4	.05	3	.04	1	.01	1,270	17.35	7,321
Putnam	7,067	69.62	2,962	29.19	102	1.00	16	.16	3	.03	3,084	30.38	10,151
St. Johns	6,599	77.85	1,787	21.08	58	.68	31	.37	2	.02	1,878	22.15	8,477
Suwannee	3,605	76.67	1,073	22.82	8	.17	14	.30	2	.04	1,097	23.33	4,702
Taylor	1,103	79.35	249	17.91	25	1.80	11	.79	2	.14	287	20.65	1,390
Union	1,491	70.24	493	23.22	17	.80	20	.94	1	.05	531	25.02	2,122
[illegible]	167,401	72.26	65,575	27.80	2,078	.81	2,161	.95	178	.06	67,892	29.74	228,293
[illegible]													
Brevard	37,021	83.36	6,500	14.64	465	1.02	397	.89	40	.09	7,392	16.64	44,413
Indian River	6,963	75.79	2,079	22.63	118	1.28	26	.28	1	.01	2,224	24.21	9,187
Lake	13,645	78.18	3,445	19.74	286	1.64	64	.37	13	.07	3,808	21.82	17,453
Okeechobee	3,816	81.17	479	10.19	277	5.89	15	.32	114	2.42	885	18.83	4,701
Orange	55,338	70.27	18,715	23.77	3,457	4.39	1,174	1.49	61	.08	23,407	29.73	78,745
Osceola	8,639	85.94	843	8.41	461	4.59	103	1.02	4	.04	1,413	14.06	10,052
St. Lucie	8,382	58.20	5,788	40.19	195	1.35	30	.21	7	.05	6,020	41.80	14,403
Seminole	30,234	82.02	5,188	14.12	993	2.70	419	1.14	4	.01	6,604	17.98	36,738
Sumter	3,166	72.27	1,152	26.30	52	1.19	3	.07	8	.18	1,215	27.73	4,381
Volusia	28,124	78.00	7,100	19.69	647	1.79	169	.47	17	.05	7,933	22.00	36,057
[illegible]	195,529	76.22	51,291	20.03	6,941	2.71	2,400	.94	269	.11	60,901	23.78	256,130
[illegible]													
Charlotte	6,896	93.32	306	4.71	102	1.38	76	1.03	7	.09	493	6.67	7,389
Collier	2,602	71.33	920	25.22	108	2.96	18	.49	-	.00	1,046	28.67	3,648
Glades	551	65.36	235	27.88	43	5.10	1	.12	13	1.54	292	34.64	843
Hardee	2,795	68.56	432	10.60	837	20.53	7	.17	6	.15	1,282	31.44	4,077
Hernando	6,862	88.67	727	9.39	118	1.52	30	.39	2	.03	877	11.33	7,739
Highlands	5,314	71.68	1,786	24.09	243	3.28	37	.50	33	.45	2,099	28.32	7,413
Hillsborough	81,793	73.98	22,356	20.22	5,371	4.86	965	.87	77	.07	28,769	26.02	110,562
Lee	22,670	78.21	4,867	16.08	1,515	5.01	183	.60	30	.10	6,595	21.79	30,265
Manatee	16,581	79.00	3,609	17.19	640	3.05	136	.65	23	.11	4,408	21.00	20,989
Pasco	24,383	92.67	1,023	4.12	656	2.49	128	.49	63	.24	1,930	7.33	26,313
Pinellas	68,282	80.82	14,899	17.63	341	.40	926	1.10	43	.05	16,209	19.18	84,491
Polk	43,213	75.65	12,413	21.73	1,065	1.86	354	.63	70	.12	13,907	24.35	57,120
Sarasota	20,198	85.96	2,725	11.60	344	1.46	219	.93	12	.05	3,300	14.04	23,498
[illegible]	340,140	78.87	66,366	17.27	11,383	2.96	3,085	.80	379	.10	81,207	21.13	384,347
[illegible]													
Broward	87,383	69.47	31,790	25.27	5,298	4.21	1,684	.86	226	.18	38,398	30.53	125,781
Collier	10,270	73.55	1,031	7.38	2,526	18.09	51	.37	86	.62	3,694	26.45	13,964
Dade	64,044	28.84	69,557	31.32	86,165	38.80	2,198	.99	94	.04	158,014	71.16	222,058
Hendry	2,923	61.70	1,043	21.94	669	14.07	13	.27	96	2.02	1,821	38.30	4,754
Martin	7,705	81.05	1,424	14.98	329	3.46	39	.41	9	.09	1,801	18.95	9,506
Monroe	5,460	74.18	761	10.34	975	13.25	146	1.98	18	.24	1,900	25.82	7,360
Palm Beach	44,420	62.57	20,756	29.24	5,193	7.31	489	.69	139	.20	26,577	37.43	70,997
[illegible]	222,215	48.90	126,362	27.81	101,155	22.26	4,020	.88	668	.15	232,205	51.10	454,420
TOTAL TOTAL	997,359	67.17%	349,500	23.54%	122,393	8.24%	13,885	.94%	1,780	.12%	487,558	32.83%	1,484,917
[illegible]	990,231	67.21%	348,279	23.50%	122,106	8.24%	13,875	.94%	1,779	.12%	486,039	32.79%	1,482,270

*Percents may not add to 100% due to rounding.

120

STATE TOTALS

	GRADE PRE-K	GRADE K	GRADE 01	GRADE 02	GRADE 03	GRADE 04	GRADE 05	GRADE 06	GRADE 07	GRADE 08	GRADE 09	GRADE 10	GRADE 11	GRADE 12	GRADE ADULT	PROGRAM TOTAL
201	EDUCABLE MENTALLY HANDICAPPED	274.16	578.32	767.34	1001.67	1101.16	1210.53	1262.15	1256.16	1263.30	1387.05	1366.05	1144.50	897.53		13,690.56
202	TRAINABLE MENTALLY HANDICAPPED	178.31	276.15	265.88	255.66	246.84	287.29	372.91	298.83	384.05	591.14	376.37	385.40	967.39		4,975.57
203	PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED	129.08	128.15	106.33	111.63	109.89	114.35	112.46	105.09	73.98	88.75	70.29	49.35	44.89		1,439.12
204	PHYSICAL/OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY PT	34.62	40.99	35.88	34.99	30.90	27.78	25.70	18.93	15.46	13.79	11.12	11.67	16.18		359.34
205	SPEECH/HEARING THERAPY PT	672.01	659.33	509.85	558.12	408.29	309.93	258.59	175.90	129.47	115.61	96.14	80.50	92.70		4,344.00
206	DEAF	98.29	77.58	83.31	84.51	90.98	87.06	101.54	96.45	57.00	70.45	68.25	92.60	68.98		1,26 8.15
207	VISUALLY HANDICAPPED PT	7.25	12.79	11.47	11.14	12.31	10.45	10.93	11.25	12.55	10.64	9.80	6.23	7.43		142.30
208	VISUALLY HANDICAPPED	12.40	15.83	14.07	17.16	13.52	19.14	10.88	8.03	7.29	3.32	1.66	1.95	.09		154.38
209	EMOTIONALLY HANDICAPPED PT	17.35	86.02	164.78	266.61	320.08	343.33	290.66	307.69	241.96	198.68	138.59	72.89	31.74		2,486.21
210	EMOTIONALLY HANDICAPPED	102.10	216.45	417.49	556.10	719.85	731.93	634.04	594.73	451.50	344.13	230.85	110.97	84.36		5,744.58
211	SPECIFIC LEARNING DISABILITY PT	53.77	461.63	983.25	1427.32	1528.02	1657.70	1526.25	1460.01	1226.60	1042.44	843.89	549.33	329.00		13,092.94
212	SPECIFIC LEARNING DISABILITY	76.82	290.60	661.02	983.43	1352.33	1325.50	1155.82	1072.32	782.45	725.55	616.52	424.95	261.95		9,800.12
213	GIFTED PT	25.35	262.24	580.05	926.10	1124.58	1230.63	1372.61	1256.35	1066.31	576.57	377.43	178.58	136.05		9,913.26
214	HOSPITAL/HOMEBOUND PT	10.30	9.76	9.63	11.58	11.52	15.88	27.76	45.69	53.22	83.57	72.35	59.97	44.04		465.58
215	PROFOUNDLY HANDICAPPED	149.71	253.88	224.04	257.53	269.14	298.64	402.51	314.99	290.65	322.89	281.75	247.01	635.13		4,068.53
**	TOTAL EXCEPTIONAL EDUCATION	1,841.52	3,369.70	4,934.16	6,503.15	7,339.38	7,668.14	7,564.81	7,022.42	6,055.89	5,552.58	4,461.26	3,415.10	3,617.46		70,482.65

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

STATE SUMMARY OF SELECTED STUDENT DATA

	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	Percent Change Since 1978-79
Student Membership						
Pre-K - 12	1,513,886	1,506,215	1,510,517	1,488,073	1,484,917	- 1.91%
K - 12	1,510,633	1,502,846	1,508,125	1,485,593	1,482,270	- 1.88
Membership by Grade and Graduates						
Pre-Kindergarten	3,253	3,369	2,392	2,480	2,647	- 18.63
Kindergarten	89,264	90,686	89,162	89,175	97,026	8.70
Grade 1	118,417	115,291	115,419	110,740	107,419	- 9.29
Grade 2	115,223	114,596	110,686	109,013	105,708	- 11.34
Grade 3	116,666	120,785	117,863	112,927	111,596	- 4.35
Grade 4	111,973	121,189	124,199	118,139	114,327	2.10
Grade 5	107,522	112,454	122,827	124,144	119,118	10.78
Grade 6	110,340	111,726	116,777	123,959	125,844	14.05
Grade 7	121,652	120,024	123,040	125,582	132,813	9.17
Grade 8	126,269	121,332	119,474	118,664	122,589	- 2.91
Grade 9	137,443	130,610	127,440	122,456	124,308	- 9.56
Grade 10	135,968	133,544	129,868	125,223	121,122	- 10.92
Grade 11	116,970	113,744	113,644	108,664	107,291	- 8.27
Grade 12	98,926	96,865	96,706	96,907	93,109	- 5.88
Graduates	87,633	87,826	88,755	89,199	*	1.79
Membership in Selected Programs for Exceptional Students						
Educable Mentally Handicapped	21,269	20,214	18,778	17,251	16,061	- 24.49
Trainable Mentally Handicapped	4,727	4,629	4,808	4,576	4,758	.66
Specific Learning Disability	40,378	43,642	50,036	51,810	55,202	36.71
Emotionally Handicapped	8,803	9,791	11,471	12,125	13,468	52.99
Speech/Hearing Therapy PT	38,113	39,904	41,093	39,576	40,899	7.31
Profoundly Handicapped	1,151	1,369	2,597	3,356	3,783	228.67
Gifted	20,710	22,739	28,141	30,375	34,343	65.83
Other Exceptionalities	5,268	5,081	5,754	4,576	5,922	12.41
Total Membership	140,419	147,369	162,678	163,645	174,436	24.23
School Dropouts, K-12	42,227	42,460	41,117	33,445	*	- 20.80
Nonpromotions	124,688	120,920	112,718	111,244	*	- 10.78
Suspensions (out of school 1 or more days)	80,198	76,111	83,229	86,875	*	8.33
Corporal Punishment	190,220	180,739	181,589	184,042	*	- 3.25
Expulsions	530	553	551	604	*	13.96
Students Referred to Alternative Education Programs						
Disciplinary Reasons	15,215	22,717	21,193	24,724	*	- 45.32
Nondisciplinary Reasons	12,195	32,209	33,207	20,209	*	65.72
Students Referred to Courts/ Juvenile Authorities	4,609	3,716	3,747	3,146	*	- 31.76%

*Data not yet collected for current school year.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Gifted by Age

7/27/83

ANNUAL DATA REPORT—1982-83 — TOTAL ESE PROGRAM—STUDENTS

	REGULAR CLASS (A)				SEPARATE CLASS (B)				SEPRT. SCH. FAC. (C)				OTHER ED. ENVIR. (D)				EARL. ED. (E)	
	CHILD. WHO REC. ED. IN REG. CL. BY AGE CLASS. SUPPL-EMENTED BY SPE			ADD. CHILD NEED. PLACE	CHILD. WHO REC. SPE IN SEPRT. CLASS BY AGE CLASS.			ADD. CHILD NEED. PLACE	CHILD. WHO REC. SPE IN SEPRT FACILITIES BY AGE CLASS.			ADD. CHILD NEED. PLACE	CHILD. WHO REC. SPE IN OTHER ENVIRONMENT BY AGE CLASS.			ADD. CHILD NEED. PLACE	CHILD WHO REC. EDL.	
DISTS	1 3-5	2 6-17	3 18-21	4 3-21	5 3-5	6 6-17	7 18-21	8 3-21	9 3-5	10 6-17	11 18-21	12 3-21	13 3-5	14 6-17	15 18-21	16 3-21	17 0-2	18 TOTAL
																		951
ALACHUA	4	947																16
BAKER		16																214
BAY		213	1															38
BRADFORD		38																1492
BREVARD	2	1473				17												4834
BROWARD	30	4798	6															0
CALHOUN																		122
CHARLOTTE		122																328
CITRUS	6	322																801
CLAY	4	797																469
COLLIER		469																131
COLUMBIA		131																2750
DADE	3	2745	2															83
DE SOTO		83		4														48
DIXIE	4	44																2486
DUVAL	12	2474																550
ESCAMBIA		550																41
FLAGLER		41																0
FRANKLIN																		62
GADSDEN	2	60																0
GILCHRIST																		8
GLADES		8																0
GULF																		0
HAMILTON																		58
HARDEE		58																38
HENDRY		18																159
HERNANDO		159																204
HIGHLAND	6	198																1749
HILLSBOR		1745	4															0
HOLMES																		202
INDIAN R		202																86
JACKSON		84																42
JEFFERSO		42																8
LAFAYETT		8																356
LAKE		355	1															1276
LEE		1276																629
LEON		629																137
LEVY		137																0
LIBERTY																		46
MADISON		46																332
MANATEE		332																603
MARION	3	600																191
MARTIN	2	189																120
MONROE					1	119												91
NASSAU		51	38															1147
OKALOOSA		1147																72
OKEECHOB		72																3056
ORANGE	23	3025	8															149
OSCEOLA		149																1923
PALM BCH	15	1860	1			30			1	16								514
PASCO		514																3554
PINELLAS	20	3534																622
POLK	6	616																139
PUTNAM		139																206
ST. JOHN	1	205																151
ST. LUCIE		151																332
SANTA RO		311	21							317	253							590
SARASOTA																		1169
SEMINOLE		1167	2															29
SUMTER		29																26
SUWANNEE		23	3															43
TAYLOR		43																18
UNION	1	17																910
VOLUSIA		427				483												48
WAKULLA	1	47																26
WALTON		23	3															10
WASHINGT		10																
TOTALS>	145	34991	90	4	1	649	0	0	1	353	253	0	0	0	0	0	0	36483

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 2

STUDENTS IN MEMBERSHIP BY GRADE
FALL 1982

	Prek	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
	72	1,395	1,473	1,558	1,534	1,572	1,629	1,710	1,812	1,591	1,438	1,513	1,329	1,109	19,735
	3	162	154	162	164	150	146	148	181	175	176	149	139	104	2,014
	10	2,809	2,949	2,971	2,922	3,036	3,129	3,565	3,458	3,334	3,756	3,135	2,713	2,911	40,703
	-	118	120	150	122	138	144	141	161	149	127	103	104	39	1,666
	-	648	600	707	708	782	747	720	764	668	573	589	448	444	8,429
	-	175	167	149	179	157	196	211	178	166	157	209	143	151	2,238
	-	210	257	233	230	269	251	249	319	266	291	242	250	195	3,262
	2	645	614	595	604	620	624	620	681	556	605	508	498	430	7,602
	-	170	184	154	183	146	203	177	182	169	159	161	114	113	2,115
	134	1,456	1,643	1,671	1,837	1,755	1,765	1,963	1,803	1,700	2,122	1,553	1,443	1,331	22,176
	60	69	85	79	72	83	85	82	90	77	68	70	72	48	1,040
	-	229	236	235	295	299	280	227	254	234	325	240	201	154	3,219
	-	1,438	1,791	1,726	1,612	1,740	1,808	1,866	1,983	1,791	1,716	1,692	1,735	1,728	22,626
	9	820	815	812	872	852	988	1,036	1,050	1,067	975	941	895	858	11,990
	-	234	259	285	283	278	278	267	271	306	217	221	227	169	3,295
	-	173	193	198	188	190	197	212	197	215	192	216	154	121	2,446
	-	282	281	266	270	302	320	338	356	285	274	271	256	223	3,724
	-	170	236	218	228	243	259	250	254	247	335	331	350	345	3,434
	390	11,213	12,057	12,169	12,301	12,613	13,069	13,782	13,994	12,996	13,505	12,144	11,991	10,563	141,993
	7	1,488	1,636	1,550	1,656	1,713	1,664	1,839	1,922	1,823	1,886	1,764	1,463	1,360	21,771
	1	247	260	251	269	251	288	315	286	280	295	262	199	245	3,449
	-	267	318	301	318	305	329	338	304	336	348	278	250	174	3,866
	3	560	586	539	591	674	628	675	794	748	717	698	696	733	8,642
	7	1,018	1,102	1,140	1,237	1,217	1,355	1,564	1,608	1,486	1,432	1,394	1,302	1,089	16,953
	-	553	512	513	590	521	570	564	696	568	602	573	473	452	7,097
	-	131	120	119	89	121	144	138	167	161	139	130	119	95	1,673
	476	6,949	7,557	7,501	7,949	8,041	8,073	7,799	9,105	8,167	7,040	6,245	6,362	5,699	99,163
	-	148	144	155	158	136	180	183	186	186	143	153	118	119	2,011
	-	107	107	107	94	97	122	131	138	130	123	111	97	112	1,476
	-	188	173	190	198	167	185	182	161	185	181	168	144	130	2,252
	-	67	80	91	65	97	87	77	97	64	76	56	70	51	978
	-	314	293	309	308	296	363	342	396	374	329	283	276	215	4,098
	-	1,503	1,562	1,609	1,664	1,721	1,819	1,941	1,911	1,886	2,141	1,978	1,698	1,397	22,823
	-	533	498	585	577	612	619	663	663	572	598	553	407	441	7,321
	2	662	811	772	777	799	864	880	871	833	951	793	636	524	10,151
	23	622	581	648	684	695	739	723	801	673	764	552	642	319	8,477
	3	283	307	389	337	344	438	418	389	327	490	330	257	286	4,702
	-	132	114	110	128	120	127	111	147	103	90	73	70	65	1,390
	515	16,770	16,364	16,829	17,489	17,929	18,614	18,883	20,552	18,904	18,345	18,364	15,369	13,506	228,293
	6	2,872	2,798	2,761	2,950	3,125	3,254	3,913	3,862	3,638	4,002	4,627	3,766	3,382	44,419
	-	711	660	615	674	682	683	722	749	843	752	740	720	636	9,187
	21	1,244	1,342	1,210	1,268	1,299	1,447	1,490	1,628	1,354	1,474	1,251	1,184	1,141	17,453
	8	400	363	290	425	342	391	412	436	399	329	321	276	209	4,701
	122	5,104	5,682	5,497	5,771	5,938	6,333	6,363	7,088	6,575	6,430	6,633	5,929	5,269	78,745
	22	678	815	754	818	780	761	931	879	813	872	753	680	507	10,052
Lucie	36	1,135	1,186	1,112	1,236	1,205	1,168	1,261	1,272	1,131	1,352	785	837	687	14,403
ole	89	2,292	2,699	2,462	2,701	2,723	2,738	3,249	3,248	3,220	3,273	3,050	2,630	2,364	36,738
er	4	305	347	324	340	346	380	359	344	360	350	349	323	250	4,381
	44	1,839	2,800	2,500	2,615	2,802	2,989	3,002	3,159	3,010	2,867	3,201	2,735	2,394	36,057
	409	16,580	18,692	17,725	18,798	19,342	20,144	21,702	22,665	21,343	21,701	21,310	19,080	16,839	256,130
CENTRAL															
otte	64	404	392	412	427	457	441	545	695	787	740	882	668	672	7,389
to	5	291	297	284	329	282	282	321	331	288	315	223	221	179	3,648
es	-	57	66	61	70	78	67	65	78	69	63	48	66	55	843
ee	-	286	369	331	337	334	368	323	370	351	298	293	217	200	4,077
ando	2	457	470	558	586	601	619	748	734	686	622	717	508	440	7,739
ands	102	698	513	510	558	560	597	565	596	540	619	543	527	485	7,413
sborough	51	6,802	8,350	7,776	8,529	8,698	9,043	9,169	9,423	9,031	8,711	9,274	8,551	7,154	110,562
	119	1,983	2,195	2,146	2,222	2,423	2,449	2,707	2,731	2,423	2,612	2,324	2,066	1,865	30,265
atee	23	1,550	1,673	1,557	1,673	1,681	1,712	1,897	1,841	1,692	1,647	1,465	1,331	1,247	20,989
co	101	1,590	1,864	1,797	1,960	2,050	2,043	2,379	2,500	2,234	2,104	2,335	1,924	1,430	26,313
llas	60	4,805	5,609	5,675	6,133	6,330	6,605	7,437	7,683	7,185	7,603	7,185	6,538	5,643	84,491
	187	3,790	4,327	4,112	4,553	4,523	4,641	4,911	4,990	4,801	4,580	4,311	4,112	3,262	57,120
sota	-	1,568	1,518	1,590	1,667	1,756	1,919	2,097	2,061	1,862	1,879	1,835	1,738	2,009	23,498
	718	24,981	27,643	26,809	29,044	29,773	30,779	33,164	34,033	31,449	31,793	31,235	28,465	24,665	384,347
ard	140	9,117	7,940	8,263	8,843	9,267	9,582	10,759	10,885	10,410	11,887	10,874	9,852	7,962	125,781
ant	18	955	1,087	1,029	1,011	1,045	1,099	1,115	1,264	1,133	1,226	985	974	1,023	13,964
	252	12,874	16,727	16,352	17,185	17,415	18,382	18,467	21,010	18,167	17,254	18,946	16,028	12,899	222,058
	29	361	352	355	406	358	430	390	460	381	349	361	283	243	4,754
	38	667	607	639	684	680	715	810	852	814	910	819	755	566	9,506
	-	481	515	575	558	559	609	650	661	615	605	578	501	453	7,360
	21	4,725	5,005	4,963	5,077	5,347	5,715	6,122	6,437	5,877	6,632	5,676	4,963	4,410	70,997
	499	29,180	32,263	32,176	33,764	34,671	36,532	38,313	41,564	37,397	38,963	38,239	33,306	27,556	454,420
TOTAL	1,947	97,026	107,419	105,708	111,596	114,327	119,118	125,844	132,813	122,589	124,308	121,122	107,291	93,109	1,484,917

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

State of Florida
Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida
Ralph D. Turlington, Commissioner
Affirmative action/equal opportunity employer

This public document was promulgated at an annual cost of $2,656.79 or $2.66 per copy to disseminate the report of the Gifted and Talented Program Study and the analysis and recommendations of the Division of Public Schools.

FLORIDA: A STATE OF EDUCATIONAL DISTINCTION. "On a statewide average, educational achievement in the State of Florida will equal that of the upper quartile of states within five years, as indicated by commonly accepted criteria of attainment."